

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>107.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1013/ASN003 Former Phurnacite Plant						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
It encloses the river and will be subject to flooding.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
C2

<b>107.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
---------------	--	--	--------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Document:		Site: 1014/ASN004 Former Phurnacite Plant						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
It encloses the river and will be subject to flooding.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
C2

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>107.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 843/ASN018 Land at Gwaun Miskin						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The site encloses land that was managed by the Wildlife Trust as a nature reserve up until 1994, British Coal preservation. The land still have nature conservation interest referable to S42 priority habitats of principle importance for the conservation of biodiversity in Wales and is much loved by local residents.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C4

<b>107.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
---------------	--	--	--------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Document:		Site: 842/ASN109 Land at House O "The Trees"						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

If this site is developed it will abutt the Tonyrefail Grasslands SSSI with obvious dangers to its nature conservation national importance terms of drainage an other risks including fire.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C2 C4

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>107.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 842/ASN109	Land at House O "The Trees"					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
This site is outside the original LDP allocation and is likely to harbour European Protected species.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
C2, C4

<b>107.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 939/ASN178	Land at Buarth y Capel					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
This site is a site with a population of European protected species.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
C2, C4

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 879/ASN001 Riverside Retail Park						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RETAIL) RCT/28/61 AS(N) 1 Riverside Retail Park, Aberaman SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.	

116.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1010/ASN002 Former Beer Bottling Stores						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/116 AS(N) 2 Former Beer Bottling Stores, Aberaman RCT/28/164 AS(N) 14 Land at Cwmbach Road, Abernant RCT/28/168 AS(N) 16 Land rear of Werfa Lane, Abernant RCT/28/170 AS(N) 17 Allotment Gardens at Windsor Terrace, Abernant SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1013/ASN003 Former Phurnacite Plant						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/151 AS(N) 3 & 4 Former Phurnacite Plant, Abercwmboi SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1014/ASN004 Former Phurnacite Plant						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/151 AS(N) 3 & 4 Former Phurnacite Plant, Abercwmboi SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A5			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 859/ASN005						Site B opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/3771 AS(N) 5 Site B Opposite Parc Newydd, Farm, Abercynon RCT/28/118 AS(N) 59 Site A Opposite Parc Newydd, Farm, Abercynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. We would like to make the developer aware that the proposed site is within close vicinity to a sewage treatment works. DCWW would normally advise that no habitable buildings be developed within a minimum of 150 metres of a sewage treatment works as by the very nature of its operation may give rise to possible effects of noise, fly and odour nuisance. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A6			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 936/ASN006						Land adjacent to Sewage treatment Works				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/62 AS(N) 6 & 7 Land adj to Sewage Treatment Works, Abercynon RCT/28/64 AS(N) 8 Land adj to Sewage Treatment Works, Abercynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. We would like to make the developer aware that the proposed site is within close vicinity to a sewage treatment works. DCWW would normally advise that no habitable buildings be developed within a minimum of 150 metres of a sewage treatment works as by the very nature of its operation may give rise to possible effects of noise, fly and odour nuisance. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cilfynydd WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A7			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 917/ASN007 Land opposite Ty Trevithick						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/62 AS(N) 6 & 7 Land adj to Sewage Treatment Works, Abercynon RCT/28/64 AS(N) 8 Land adj to Sewage Treatment Works, Abercynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. We would like to make the developer aware that the proposed site is within close vicinity to a sewage treatment works. DCWW would normally advise that no habitable buildings be developed within a minimum of 150 metres of a sewage treatment works as by the very nature of its operation may give rise to possible effects of noise, fly and odour nuisance. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cilfynydd WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A8			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 917/ASN007 Land opposite Ty Trevithick						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL & EMPLOYMENT) RCT/28/63 AS(N) 7 Land opposite Ty Trevithick, Abercynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cilfynydd WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A9			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 966/ASN008 Land adjacent to Sewage treatment Works						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/62 AS(N) 6 & 7 Land adj to Sewage Treatment Works, Abercynon RCT/28/64 AS(N) 8 Land adj to Sewage Treatment Works, Abercynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. We would like to make the developer aware that the proposed site is within close vicinity to a sewage treatment works. DCWW would normally advise that no habitable buildings be developed within a minimum of 150 metres of a sewage treatment works as by the very nature of its operation may give rise to possible effects of noise, fly and odour nuisance. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cilfynydd WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A10			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 891/ASN010 Land at Coleg Morgannwg						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EDUCATIONAL) RCT/28/65 AS(N) 10 Land at Coleg Morgannwg, Aberdare SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A11			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 953/ASN011 Cwm Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/119 AS(N) 11 Cwm Farm, Aberdare RCT/28/121 AS(N) 40 Land at Crichton Farm, Cwmbach SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A12			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 869/ASN012 Land at Abernant Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/166 AS(N) 15 Land west of Abernant Road, Abernant RCT/28/66 AS(N) 12 Land at Abernant Road, Abernant SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A13			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 993/ASN013 Land at Abernant						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT./28/162 AS(N) 13 and at Abernant, Abernant SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.	

116.A14			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 988/ASN014 Land at Cwmbach Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/116 AS(N) 2 Former Beer Bottling Stores, Aberaman RCT/28/164 AS(N) 14 Land at Cwmbach Road, Abernant RCT/28/168 AS(N) 16 Land rear of Werfa Lane, Abernant RCT/28/170 AS(N) 17 Allotment Gardens at Windsor Terrace, Abernant SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.	

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A15			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 951/ASN015 Land West of Abernant Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/166 AS(N) 15 Land west of Abernant Road, Abernant RCT/28/66 AS(N) 12 Land at Abernant Road, Abernant SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A16			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 954/ASN016 Land rear of Werfa Lane						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/116 AS(N) 2 Former Beer Bottling Stores, Aberaman RCT/28/164 AS(N) 14 Land at Cwmbach Road, Abernant RCT/28/168 AS(N) 16 Land rear of Werfa Lane, Abernant RCT/28/170 AS(N) 17 Allotment Gardens at Windsor Terrace, Abernant SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A17			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 930/ASN017 Allotment Gardens at Windsor Terrace										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/116 AS(N) 2 Former Beer Bottling Stores, Aberaman RCT/28/164 AS(N) 14 Land at Cwmbach Road, Abernant RCT/28/168 AS(N) 16 Land rear of Werfa Lane, Abernant RCT/28/170 AS(N) 17 Allotment Gardens at Windsor Terrace, Abernant SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.</p>		

116.A18			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 843/ASN018 Land at Gwaun Miskin										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/3781 AS(N) 18 Land at Gwaun Miskin, Beddau SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A19			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 955/ASN019 Land adjacent to High Mead						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/129 AS(N) 19 Land adj to High Mead, Beddau RCT/28/226 AS(N) 53 Land adj to Meadow View, Efail Isaf SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A20			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 887/ASN020 Land south of Brynteg Lane						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/132 AS(N) 20 Land south of Brynteg Lane, Beddau SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A21			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 921/ASN021 Land off Michael's Road (Rhondda LP allocation - E						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/67 AS(N) 21 Land off Michael;s Road, Blaencwm SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A22			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 995/ASN022 Land adjacent to 'Greenway'						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/3788 AS(N) 24 Land to rear of Blaenrhondda Road, Blaenrhondda RCT/28/161 AS(N) 22 Land adj to Greenway, Blaencwm RCT/28/189 AS(N) 127 Land adj to Glyn Taff Farm, Rhydyfelin RCT/28/210 AS(N) 45 Land East of Aubrey Road, Cymmer SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A23			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/68 AS(N) 23 Former Fernhill Colliery Site, Blaencwm SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement.</p> <p>The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>		

116.A24			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/3788 AS(N) 24 Land to rear of Blaenrhondda Road, Blaenrhondda RCT/28/161 AS(N) 22 Land adj to Greenway, Blaencwm RCT/28/189 AS(N) 127 Land adj to Glyn Taff Farm, Rhydyfelin RCT/28/210 AS(N) 45 Land East of Aubrey Road, Cymmer SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A25			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/69 AS(N) 25 Former Stelco Hardy Site, Blaenrhondda RCT/28/71 AS(N) 27 Former Stelco Hardy Site, Blaenrhondda SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.	

116.A26			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/70 AS(N) 26 Former Fernhill Colliery Site, Blaenrhondda SEWERAGE We have no adverse comment for this site but depending on future proposals we would need to review and make further representation. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands.WATER The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required	



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A27			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 880/ASN027 Former Stelco Hardy Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/69 AS(N) 25 Former Stelco Hardy Site, Blaenrhondda RCT/28/71 AS(N) 27 Former Stelco Hardy Site, Blaenrhondda SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.

116.A28			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 852/ASN028 Golf Course Site, Brynna Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/154 AS(N) 82 Land at the cricket field, Llanharan RCT/20/200 AS(N) 28 Golf Course Site Brynna Road, Brynna RCT/20/202 AS(N) 30 Brynna West, Brynna SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Perybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>116.A29</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 862/ASN029 Land South of Brynna Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/201 AS(N) 29 Land south of Brynna Road, Brynna SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

<b>116.A30</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 903/ASN030 Brynna West						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/154 AS(N) 82 Land at the cricket field, Llanharan RCT/20/200 AS(N) 28 Golf Course Site Brynna Road, Brynna RCT/20/202 AS(N) 30 Brynna West, Brynna SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A31			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 997/ASN031 Llwynau Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/186 AS(N) 62 Land rear of Llwynpennau Cottage, Groesfaen RCT/28/220 AS(N) 31 Llwynau Farm, Brynsadler SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A32			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 946/ASN032 North of Talygarn House						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED USE) RCT/28/192 AS(N) 100 Hendy Quarry, Miskin RCT/28/221 AS(N) 32 North of Talygarn House, Brynsadler SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>116.A33</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 956/ASN033 WPD Depot						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/133 AS(N) 33 WPD Depot, Church Village SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

<b>116.A34</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 985/ASN034 Land r/o Cilfynydd Road/ Bodwenarth						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/204 AS(N) Land rear of Cilfynydd Road, Bedwenarth, Cilfynydd SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cilfynydd WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A35			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 942/ASN035 Vans Direct HQ, yard and land to NW, Ely Valley Ro						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/3789 AS(N) 35 Vans Direct, Ely Valley Road and Elwyn Street SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A36			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 867/ASN036 Land North of Pantglas Farm, Coedely						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT) RCT28/72 AS(N) 36 Land north of Pantglas Farm, Coed Ely SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A37			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 853/ASN038 Plot 10-12 Incline Row										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/123 AS(N) 102 Mountain Ash General Hospital RCT/28/155 AS(N) 38 Plot 10-12 Incline Row, Cwmaman RCT/28/156 AS(N) 42 Land at Dare Road, Cwdare RCT/28/158 AS(N) 61 Land at 43-60 Incline Row, Godreaman SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A38			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 933/ASN039 Land at Cefnpennar Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/120 AS(N) 39 Land at Cefnpennar Road, Cwmbach RCT/28/137 AS(N) 70 Land to rear of Bute Terrace, Hirwaun RCT/28/174 AS(N) 156 Land adjacent to St Fagans, Trecynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A39			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 846/ASN040 Land at Crichton Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/119 AS(N) 11 Cwm Farm, Aberdare RCT/28/121 AS(N) 40 Land at Crichton Farm, Cwmbach SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A40			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 990/ASN042 Land at Dare Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/123 AS(N) 102 Mountain Ash General Hospital RCT/28/155 AS(N) 38 Plot 10-12 Incline Row, Cwmaman RCT/28/156 AS(N) 42 Land at Dare Road, Cwdare RCT/28/158 AS(N) 61 Land at 43-60 Incline Row, Godreaman SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A41			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 944/ASN044						Land adjoining Bedw Farm Estate					PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/208 AS(N) 44 Land adj Bedw Farm Estate, Cymmer SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A42			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 926/ASN045						Land East of Aubrey Road					PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/3788 AS(N) 24 Land to rear of Blaenrhondda Road, Blaenrhondda RCT/28/161 AS(N) 22 Land adj to Greenway, Blaencwm RCT/28/189 AS(N) 127 Land adj to Glyn Taff Farm, Rhydyfelin RCT/28/210 AS(N) 45 Land East of Aubrey Road, Cymmer SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A43			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 965/ASN046						Land rear of Wynham Street/Kimberley Way					PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/212 AS(N) 46 Land rear of Wyndham Street/Kimberley Way, Cymmer SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>116.A44</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 915/ASN047 Land to the rear of 119-130 High Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/214 AS(N) 47 Land rear of 119-130 High Street, Cymmer SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

<b>116.A45</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1001/ASN048 Land at Garth Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/216 AS(N) 48 Land at Garth Farm, Efail Isaf SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A46			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 904/ASN049 Land south of Heol Iscoed						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED USE) RCT/28/217 AS(N) 49 Land south of Heol Iscoed, Efail Isaf SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A47			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 970/ASN050 Land of Heol y Parc						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/219 AS(N) 50 Land at Heol y Parc, Efail Isaf RCT/28/169 AS(N) 91 Land at Heol Creigiau, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/195 AS(N) 138 Land at Church Road, Tonteg RCT/28/197 AS(N) 139 Land at Church Road, Tonteg SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A48			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 961/ASN051						Land adjacent to the Willows and Heol Dowlais				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/222 AS(N) 51 Land adj to Willows, Efail Isaf SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A49			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 886/ASN052						Ffrwd Phillip Farm				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/224 AS(N) 52 Ffrwd Phillip Farm, Efail Isaf SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A50			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 960/ASN053						Land adjacent to Meadow View, North				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/129 AS(N) 19 Land adj to High Mead, Beddau RCT/28/226 AS(N) 53 Land adj to Meadow View, Efail Isaf SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A51			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 898/ASN054						Land to the south of High Street				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/138 AS(N) 54 land to the South of High Street, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/227 AS(N) 144 Trane Farm, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A52			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 897/ASN055 Land South of the Ferns						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/141 AS(N) 55 Land south of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/205 AS(N) 151 Land fronting Trebanog Road, Trebanog SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A53			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 860/ASN056 Land to the rear of High Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/142 AS(N) 56 Land to the rear of High Street, Gilfach Goch SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A54			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 888/ASN057 Land East of the Ferns						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/144 AS(N) 57 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/145 AS(N) 58 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/203 AS(N) 109 Land at House O "The Trees", Penrhiwfer RCT/28/231 AS(N) 146 Land at Tylcha Fach, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A55			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 967/ASN058 Land at Meadow Cottage and Ffordd Llanbad						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/144 AS(N) 57 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/145 AS(N) 58 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/203 AS(N) 109 Land at House O "The Trees", Penrhiwfer RCT/28/231 AS(N) 146 Land at Tylcha Fach, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A56			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 952/ASN059 Land south of Grovers Field						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We thank you for allowing us to make representation on the proposed Candidate Sites. Please note that our comments are primarily for water supply and foul drainage. We have not provided any comments regarding the acceptance of surface water into the public sewer as in accordance with WAG sustainability objectives, developers are expected to establish sustainable solutions i.e. SuDS, for the disposal of surface water. DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/229 AS(N) 59 Land South of Grovers Field SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. We would like to make the developer aware that the proposed site is within close vicinity to a sewage treatment works. DCWW would normally advise that no habitable buildings be developed within a minimum of 150 metres of a sewage treatment works as by the very nature of its operation may give rise to possible effects of noise, fly and odour nuisance. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A57			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 952/ASN059 Land south of Grovers Field						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/3771 AS(N) 5 Site B Opposite Parc Newydd, Farm, Abercynon RCT/28/118 AS(N) 59 Site A Opposite Parc Newydd, Farm, Abercynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. We would like to make the developer aware that the proposed site is within close vicinity to a sewage treatment works. DCWW would normally advise that no habitable buildings be developed within a minimum of 150 metres of a sewage treatment works as by the very nature of its operation may give rise to possible effects of noise, fly and odour nuisance. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A58			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 885/ASN060 Land adjacent to Craig yr Hesg Quarry, Pontypridd						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (COMMUNITY/AMENITY) RCT/28/76 AS(N) 60 Land adj Craig y Hesg Quarry, Pontygwaith SEWERAGE We have no adverse comment for this site but depending on future proposals we would need to review and make further representation. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A59			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 998/ASN061 Land at 43-60 Incline Row						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/123 AS(N) 102 Mountain Ash General Hospital RCT/28/155 AS(N) 38 Plot 10-12 Incline Row, Cwmaman RCT/28/156 AS(N) 42 Land at Dare Road, Cwdare RCT/28/158 AS(N) 61 Land at 43-60 Incline Row, Godreaman SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A60			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 962/ASN062 Land rear of Llwynpennau Cottages						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/186 AS(N) 62 Land rear of Llwynpennau Cottage, Groesfaen RCT/28/220 AS(N) 31 Llwynau Farm, Brynsadler SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A61			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 977/ASN063 Land south of A4119						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/188 AS(N) 63 Land south of A4119, Groesfaen RCT/28/213 AS(N) 137 Land at Talygarn, Talygarn RCT/28/215 AS(N) 136 Land south of M4, North of St Annes Court, Talygarn RCT/28/163 AS(N) 85 Land to the north of Llanharry, Llanharry SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A62			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/139 AS(N) 64 Land at Hirwaun SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>		

116.A63			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 907/ASN065 Hirwaun Ironworks, North Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/136 AS(N) 65 Hirwaun Ironworks, North Site, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.</p>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>116.A64</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 851/ASN066 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (TOURISM, GREEN SPACE, OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY USE) RCT/28/77 AS(N) 66 Land at Hirwaun RCT/28/82 AS(N) 73 Land west of Mount Pleasant, Hirwaun RCT/28/83 AS(N) 74 Land between A465 and Treherbert, Hirwaun SEWERAGE As we have not been provided with sufficient information to make a detailed assessment on this allocation unfortunately we are unable to provide a meaningful response. Please would you clarify whether the recreation and community headings would include the construction of buildings which would require water supply and drainage facilities. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

<b>116.A65</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 873/ASN067 Policy CS 9.2- Waste Management, Hirwaun Industri						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/78 AS(N) 67 Hirwaun Industrial Estate, Hirwaun RCT/28/143 AS(N) 68 Hirwaun Industrial Estate, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT As you are aware the recent Waste Facility (Enviroparks) proposed at Fifth Avenue is a significant concern for DCWW. The allocation for Waste Management, Recycling & Renewable Energy schemes would need to be considered carefully in light of safeguarding the security of water supplies to our customers. DCWW consider it essential that we are consulted at the earliest possible stages for any proposals within this allocated land. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A66			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 894/ASN068 Hirwaun Industrial Estate						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OTHER) RCT/28/78 AS(N) 67 Hirwaun Industrial Estate, Hirwaun RCT/28/143 AS(N) 68 Hirwaun Industrial Estate, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT As you are aware the recent Waste Facility (Enviroparks) proposed at Fifth Avenue is a significant concern for DCWW. The allocation for Waste Management, Recycling & Renewable Energy schemes would need to be considered carefully in light of safeguarding the security of water supplies to our customers. DCWW consider it essential that we are consulted at the earliest possible stages for any proposals within this allocated land. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A67			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 848/ASN069 Land adjacent to Rhigos Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MANAGEMENT/STRATEGIC SITE) RCT/28/79 AS(N) 69 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun RCT/28/84 AS(N) 77 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun RCT/28/85 AS(N) 78 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Hirwaun WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A68			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 896/ASN070						Land rear of Bute Terrace			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/120 AS(N) 39 Land at Cefnpennar Road, Cwmbach RCT/28/137 AS(N) 70 Land to rear of Bute Terrace, Hirwaun RCT/28/174 AS(N) 156 Land adjacent to St Fagans, Trecynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A69			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 957/ASN071						Tower Colliery Pit Head Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (HERITAGE, TOURISM & LEISURE) RCT/28/80 AS(N) 71 Tower Colliery Pit Head Site, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A70			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 889/ASN072 Land opposite Gamlyn Terrace						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/81 AS(N) 72 Land opposite Gamlyn Terrace, Hirwaun RCT//28/218 AS(N) 111 Land opposite Gamlyn Terrace, Penywaun SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A71			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 958/ASN073 Land west of Mount Pleasant Inn						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (TOURISM, GREEN SPACE, OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY USE) RCT/28/77 AS(N) 66 Land at Hirwaun RCT/28/82 AS(N) 73 Land west of Mount Pleasant, Hirwaun RCT/28/83 AS(N) 74 Land between A465 and Treherbert, Hirwaun SEWERAGE As we have not been provided with sufficient information to make a detailed assessment on this allocation unfortunately we are unable to provide a meaningful response. Please would you clarify whether the recreation and community headings would include the construction of buildings which would require water supply and drainage facilities. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A72			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 959/ASN074 Land between A465 and Treherbert Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (TOURISM, GREEN SPACE, OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY USE) RCT/28/77 AS(N) 66 Land at Hirwaun RCT/28/82 AS(N) 73 Land west of Mount Pleasant, Hirwaun RCT/28/83 AS(N) 74 Land between A465 and Treherbert, Hirwaun SEWERAGE As we have not been provided with sufficient information to make a detailed assessment on this allocation unfortunately we are unable to provide a meaningful response. Please would you clarify whether the recreation and community headings would include the construction of buildings which would require water supply and drainage facilities. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>		

116.A73			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 908/ASN075 Ferrari's Bakery Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/140 AS(N) 75 Ferrari's Bakery Site, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A74			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 976/ASN076 Land adjacent to Rhigos Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/148 AS(N) 76 Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Hirwaun WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A75			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 884/ASN077 Land adjacent to Rhigos Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MANAGEMENT/STRATEGIC SITE) RCT/28/79 AS(N) 69 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun RCT/28/84 AS(N) 77 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun RCT/28/85 AS(N) 78 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Hirwaun WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>116.A76</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 877/ASN078 Land adjacent to Rhigos Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MANAGEMENT/STRATEGIC SITE) RCT/28/79 AS(N) 69 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun RCT/28/84 AS(N) 77 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun RCT/28/85 AS(N) 78 Land adj to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Hirwaun WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

<b>116.A77</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1009/ASN079 Land east of The Bungalow, Llantrisant Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT/WASTE) RCT/28/146 AS(N) 79 Land east of The Bungalow, Llanharan RCT/28/147 AS(N) 80 Land east of The Bungalow, Llanharan SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A78			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1000/ASN080						Land east of The Bungalow, Llantrisant Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT/WASTE) RCT/28/146 AS(N) 79 Land east of The Bungalow, Llanharan RCT/28/147 AS(N) 80 Land east of The Bungalow, Llanharan SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A79			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 999/ASN081						Fomer Llanharan Sewerage Treatment Works				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT) RCT/28/86 AS(N) 81 Former Llanharan Sewage Treatment Works, Llanharan SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A80			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 878/ASN082 Land at the cricket field						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/154 AS(N) 82 Land at the cricket field, Llanharan RCT/20/200 AS(N) 28 Golf Course Site Brynna Road, Brynna RCT/20/202 AS(N) 30 Brynna West, Brynna SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A81			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 902/ASN083 Land to the north of The Patch						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/159 AS(N) 83 Land to the north of The Patch, Llanharry RCT/28/173 AS(N) 113 Ceulan Stud, Pontyclun SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A82			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1008/ASN084						Land at Elms Farm			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/160 AS(N) 84 Land at Elms Farm, Llanharry SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A83			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
---------	--	--	--------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Document: Site: 987/ASN085 Land to the north of Llanharry PEX Session:

Policy: Map: Issue:

Summary:

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/188 AS(N) 63 Land south of A4119, Groesfaen RCT/28/213 AS(N) 137 Land at Talygarn, Talygarn RCT/28/215 AS(N) 136 Land south of M4, North of St Annes Court, Talygarn RCT/28/163 AS(N) 85 Land to the north of Llanharry, Llanharry SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A84			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1012/ASN086						Land at The Elms, Llanharry				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (ECO-PARK/ WASTE MANAGEMENT) RCT/28/87 AS(N) 86 Land at The Elms, Llanharry SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A85			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 941/ASN087						Land at Felindre Road, St. Mary Hill				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL, LEISURE, TOURISM, GYPSY/TRAVELLER) RCT/28/88 AS(N) 88 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/89 AS(N) 89 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/165 AS(N) 87 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/167 AS(N) 90 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>116.A86</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 974/ASN088 Land at Felindre Road, St. Mary Hill								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL, LEISURE, TOURISM, GYPSY/TRAVELLER) RCT/28/88 AS(N) 88 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/89 AS(N) 89 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/165 AS(N) 87 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/167 AS(N) 90 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water

<b>116.A87</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 964/ASN089 Land at Felindre Road, St. Mary Hill								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL, LEISURE, TOURISM, GYPSY/TRAVELLER) RCT/28/88 AS(N) 88 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/89 AS(N) 89 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/165 AS(N) 87 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/167 AS(N) 90 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A88			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 935/ASN090 Land at Felindre Road, St. Mary Hill						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL, LEISURE, TOURISM, GYPSY/TRAVELLER) RCT/28/88 AS(N) 88 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/89 AS(N) 89 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/165 AS(N) 87 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid RCT/28/167 AS(N) 90 Land at Felindre Road, St Mary Hill, Llanhilid SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Penybont WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water

116.A89			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 916/ASN091 Land at Heol Creigiau						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/219 AS(N) 50 Land at Heol y Parc, Efail Isaf RCT/28/169 AS(N) 91 Land at Heol Creigiau, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/195 AS(N) 138 Land at Church Road, Tonteg RCT/28/197 AS(N) 139 Land at Church Road, Tonteg SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A90			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1006/ASN092 Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL OR MIXED USE B1 OFFICE & RETAIL) RCT/28/171 AS(N) 92 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/90 AS(N) 94 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/91 AS(N) 95 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A91			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 994/ASN093 Newtown Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/172 AS(N) 93 Newtown Industrial Estate, Llantwit Fardre SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A92			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 911/ASN094 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL OR MIXED USE B1 OFFICE & RETAIL) RCT/28/171 AS(N) 92 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/90 AS(N) 94 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/91 AS(N) 95 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A93			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 910/ASN095 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL OR MIXED USE B1 OFFICE & RETAIL) RCT/28/171 AS(N) 92 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/90 AS(N) 94 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/91 AS(N) 95 Ystrad Barwig Isaf, Llantwit Fardre SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A94			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1011/ASN096						Land at Bryn Pica			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:			Issue:								
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RECYCLING & WASTE MANAGEMENT) RCT/28/92 AS(N) 96 Land at Bryn Pica, LLwydcoed SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.

116.A95			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 992/ASN097						Land off Hospital Site			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:			Issue:								
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/126 AS(N) 169 Land to the north east of Carne Street, Treorchy RCT/28/128 AS(N) 172 Land at Tynebedw Terrace, Treorchy RCT/28/190 AS(N) 97 Land off Hospital Site, Llwynypia SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A96			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 876/ASN098 NSA 14.1 - Ferndale & Highfield Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL &amp; MIXED USE) RCT/28/149 AS(N) 98 Ferndale &amp; Highfield Industrial, Maerdy RCT/28/150 AS(N) 99 Ferndale &amp; Highfield Industrial, Maerdy SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>		

116.A97			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 950/ASN099 NSA 14.1 - Ferndale & Highfield Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL &amp; MIXED USE) RCT/28/149 AS(N) 98 Ferndale &amp; Highfield Industrial, Maerdy RCT/28/150 AS(N) 99 Ferndale &amp; Highfield Industrial, Maerdy SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A98			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 901/ASN100 Hendy Quarry						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED USE) RCT/28/192 AS(N) 100 Hendy Quarry, Miskin RCT/28/221 AS(N) 32 North of Talygarn House, Brynsadler SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A99			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1020/ASN101 Land at Maes y Dderwen						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/122 AS(N) 101 Land at Maes y Dderwen, Mountain Ash SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>116.A100</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 865/ASN102 Mountain Ash General Hospital										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/123 AS(N) 102 Mountain Ash General Hospital RCT/28/155 AS(N) 38 Plot 10-12 Incline Row, Cwmaman RCT/28/156 AS(N) 42 Land at Dare Road, Cwdare RCT/28/158 AS(N) 61 Land at 43-60 Incline Row, Godreaman SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

<b>116.A101</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 932/ASN103 Land at Mwyndy										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/196 AS(N) 103 & 104 Land at Mwyndy, Mwyndy SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A102			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 913/ASN104 Land at Mwyndy						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/196 AS(N) 103 & 104 Land at Mwyndy, Mwyndy SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WWTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A103			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 984/ASN105 Land at Mwyndy Quarry						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (STRATEGIC) RCT/28/93 AS(N) 105 Land at Mwyndy Quarry, Mwyndy SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A104			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 989/ASN106 Land at Parc Nantgarw						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT/EDUCATION) RCT/28/94 AS(N) 106 Land at Parc Nantgarw, Nantgarw SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A105			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 929/ASN107 Land at former allotment at Pantygraigwen Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/198 AS(N) 107 Land at allotments at Pantygraigwen Road, Pantygraigwen SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A106			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 928/ASN108 Land at former Allotment site at Pantygraigwen Roa						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/152 AS(N) 161 Land at Rhigos Road, Treberbert RCT/28/199 AS(N) 108 Land at allotments at Pantygraigwen Road, Pantygraigwen RCT/28/183 AS(N) 122 Land at Mount Pleasant, Porth SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A107			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 842/ASN109 Land at House O "The Trees"						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/144 AS(N) 57 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/145 AS(N) 58 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/203 AS(N) 109 Land at House O "The Trees", Penrhifwr RCT/28/231 AS(N) 146 Land at Tylcha Fach, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A108			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1015/ASN110 Land South of Penywaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RECYCLING & WASTE MANAGEMENT) RCT/28/95 AS(N) 110 Land south of Penywaun, Penywaun SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.

116.A109			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 866/ASN111 Land opposite Gamlyn Terrace						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/81 AS(N) 72 Land opposite Gamlyn Terrace, Hirwaun RCT//28/218 AS(N) 111 Land opposite Gamlyn Terrace, Penywaun SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A110			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 971/ASN112 Land at Leekes / Royal Mail						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (SITE SSA) RCT/28/96 AS(N) 112 Land at Leekes/Royal Mail, Pontyclun SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A111			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 973/ASN113 Ceulan Stud, Pontyclun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/159 AS(N) 83 Land to the north of The Patch, Llanharry RCT/28/173 AS(N) 113 Ceulan Stud, Pontyclun SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A112			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 854/ASN114 Land at Crabtree and Evelyn						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/177 AS(N) 114 Land at Crabtree and Evelyn, Pontyclun SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A113			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 844/ASN115 Pontygwaith Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (COMMUNITY HUB) RCT/28/97 AS(N) 115 Pontygwaith Industrial Estate, Pontygwaith SEWERAGE We have no adverse comment for this site but depending on future proposals we would need to review and make further representation. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A114			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 850/ASN116 Land at Heatherview Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/179 AS(N) 116 Land at Heathview Road, Pontypridd RCT/28/185 AS(N) 123 Off Llanwonno Road/Lady Lewis Tip, Porth SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>		

116.A115			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 845/ASN117 Goods Yard Car Park						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (PARK &amp; RIDE SITE) RCT/28/98 AS(N) 117 Goods Yard Car Park, Pontypridd SEWERAGE We note that some of the proposals you have asked us to comment on are: Relief Roads and Park n Ride Sites. These examples can be dealt with under the NRSWA (New Roads and Street Works Act) process. We will only provide comments if new builds where there is a direct impact on our assets. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A116			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 872/ASN118 University of Glamorgan						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EDUCATIONAL USE) RCT/28/99 AS(N) 118 University of Glamorgan, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A117			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 870/ASN119 Treforest Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT) RCT/28/100 as(n) 119 Treforest Industrial Estate, Pontypridd RCT/28/101 AS(N) 120 & 158 Treforest Industrial Estate, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>116.A118</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 881/ASN120 Treforest Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT) RCT/28/100 as(n) 119 Treforest Industrial Estate, Pontypridd RCT/28/101 AS(N) 120 & 158 Treforest Industrial Estate, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

<b>116.A119</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 892/ASN121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/130 AS(N) 176 Land t the west of Ynyshir, Ynyshir RCT/28/131 AS(N) 178 Land at Buarth y Capel, Ynysybwll RCT/28/184 AS(N) 174 Site off Heol Llechau, Wattstown RCT/28/181 AS(N) 121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A120			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 996/ASN122 Land at Mount Pleasant						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/152 AS(N) 161 Land at Rhigos Road, Treberbert RCT/28/199 AS(N) 108 Land at allotments at Pantygraigwen Road, Pantygraigwen RCT/28/183 AS(N) 122 Land at Mount Pleasant, Porth SEWORAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A121			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 940/ASN123 Large site off Llanwonno Road /Lady Lewis Tip						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/179 AS(N) 116 Land at Heathview Road, Pontypridd RCT/28/185 AS(N) 123 Off Llanwonno Road/Lady Lewis Tip, Porth SEWORAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A122			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 948/ASN124 Land off Hollybush Grove/Penrhiwgynt Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/187 AS(N) 124 Land off Hollybush Grove/Penrhiwgynt Rd, Porth SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Parts of this development site is at an elevation where mains pressure cannot be guaranteed. Dwr Cymru are not obligated to provide mains water to a height greater than that it will flow by gravitation and therefore the developer would need to make suitable arrangements at his own cost to provide mains water to this area.

116.A123			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 931/ASN125 Werfa Farm						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/124 AS(N) 125 Werfa Farm, Rhigos SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Hirwaun WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A124			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 858/ASN126 Land at Halt Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/125 AS(N) 126 Land at Halt Road, Rhigos SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Hirwaun WwtW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A125			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 900/ASN127 Land adjacent to Glyn Taff Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/3788 AS(N) 24 Land to rear of Blaenrhondda Road, Blaenrhondda RCT/28/161 AS(N) 22 Land adj to Greenway, Blaencwm RCT/28/189 AS(N) 127 Land adj to Glyn Taff Farm, Rhydyfelin RCT/28/210 AS(N) 45 Land East of Aubrey Road, Cymmer SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwtW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A126			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 875/ASN128 Alexon Site, Cardiff Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/191 AS(N) 128 Alexon Site, Cardiff Road, Rhydyfelin SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A127			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 847/ASN129 Land at Ysgubor-wen Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (STRATEGIC SITE) RCT/28/102 AS(N) 129 Land at Ysgubor-wen Farm, Robertstown SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A128			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1007/ASN130 Forgemasters Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT AND RETAIL) RCT/28/103 AS(N) 130 Forgemasters Site, Taffs Well RCT/28/104 AS(N) 131 Forgemasters Site, Taffs Well SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this waterThe proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>	

116.A129			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1005/ASN131 Forgemasters Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT AND RETAIL) RCT/28/103 AS(N) 130 Forgemasters Site, Taffs Well RCT/28/104 AS(N) 131 Forgemasters Site, Taffs Well SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this waterThe proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.</p>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A130			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1004/ASN132 Forgemasters Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/232 AS(N) 132 Forgemasters Site, Taffs Well SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. This proposal represents a substantial area for development. We would need to undertake an assessment of our Waste Water Treatment Works to understand the impact on our asset. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A131			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 905/ASN133 Land at Garth Isaf Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/193 AS(N) 133 Land at Garth Isaf Farm, Talbot Green RCT/28/194 AS(N) 134 Garth Isaf Farm, Talbot Green SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A132			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 857/ASN134 Garth Isaf Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MIXED) RCT/28/193 AS(N) 133 Land at Garth Isaf Farm, Talbot Green RCT/28/194 AS(N) 134 Garth Isaf Farm, Talbot Green SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.

116.A133			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 982/ASN136 Land South of the M4, North of St. Annes Court						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/188 AS(N) 63 Land south of A4119, Groesfaen RCT/28/213 AS(N) 137 Land at Talygarn, Talygarn RCT/28/215 AS(N) 136 Land south of M4, North of St Annes Court, Talygarn RCT/28/163 AS(N) 85 Land to the north of Llanharry, Llanharry SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A134			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1018/ASN137 Land at Talygarn						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/188 AS(N) 63 Land south of A4119, Groesfaen RCT/28/213 AS(N) 137 Land at Talygarn, Talygarn RCT/28/215 AS(N) 136 Land south of M4, North of St Annes Court, Talygarn RCT/28/163 AS(N) 85 Land to the north of Llanharry, Llanharry SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A135			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 868/ASN138 Land at Church Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/219 AS(N) 50 Land at Heol y Parc, Efail Isaf RCT/28/169 AS(N) 91 Land at Heol Creigiau, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/195 AS(N) 138 Land at Church Road, Tonteg RCT/28/197 AS(N) 139 Land at Church Road, Tonteg SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A136			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 949/ASN139 Land at Church Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/219 AS(N) 50 Land at Heol y Parc, Efail Isaf RCT/28/169 AS(N) 91 Land at Heol Creigiau, Llantwit Fardre RCT/28/195 AS(N) 138 Land at Church Road, Tonteg RCT/28/197 AS(N) 139 Land at Church Road, Tonteg SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Rhiwsaeson WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A137			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 882/ASN140 Land at Parc Eirin						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT) RCT/28/105 AS(N) 140 Land at Parc Erin, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>116.A138</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 986/ASN141 Land South of Gilfach Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/211 AS(N) 155 land north of Rhiw Garn Fawr, Trebanog RCT/28/230 AS(N) 141 Land south of Gilfach Road, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.</p>		

<b>116.A139</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 972/ASN142 SSA 10.10 - Land east of Hafod Wen and north of Co						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/206 AS(N) 152 Land south of Trebanog (Rhiw Garn Fawr), Trebanog RCT/28/207 AS(N) 153 Land adj to Rhiw Garn Fawr, Trebanog RCT/28/223 AS(N) 142 Land east of Hafod Wen and North of Concorde Drive, Tonyrefail RCT/28/228 AS(N) 145 Land at Trane Farm, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.</p>		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A140			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 863/ASN143 St. Johns The Baptist's Church						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/225 AS(N) 143 St John The Baptist Church, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A141			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 934/ASN144 SSA 10.2 - Trane Farm						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/138 AS(N) 54 land to the South of High Street, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/227 AS(N) 144 Trane Farm, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A142			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 991/ASN145 Land at Trane Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/206 AS(N) 152 Land south of Trebanog (Rhiw Garn Fawr), Trebanog RCT/28/207 AS(N) 153 Land adj to Rhiw Garn Fawr, Trebanog RCT/28/223 AS(N) 142 Land east of Hafod Wen and North of Concorde Drive, Tonyrefail RCT/28/228 AS(N) 145 Land at Trane Farm, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A143			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1017/ASN146 Land at Tylcha Fach						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/144 AS(N) 57 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/145 AS(N) 58 Land east of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/203 AS(N) 109 Land at House O "The Trees", Penrhiwfer RCT/28/231 AS(N) 146 Land at Tylcha Fach, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A144			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 969/ASN147 Land off Mill Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/178 AS(N) 147 Land off Mill Street, Tonyrefail RCT/28/180 AS(N) 148 Land at Tlyndale/Rhiwinder Fach, Pant y Brad, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. water. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A145			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 963/ASN148 Land at Glyndale / Rhiwinder Fach, Pant y Brad						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/178 AS(N) 147 Land off Mill Street, Tonyrefail RCT/28/180 AS(N) 148 Land at Tlyndale/Rhiwinder Fach, Pant y Brad, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Please be advised that there are no public sewers in close proximity to the development. Should a communication be required to the public sewer, then developers would need to contact DCWW on this matter. water. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A146			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 864/ASN149 Land rear of Mill Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/182 AS(N) 149 Land rear of Mill Street, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A147			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 890/ASN150 Ynys Field Site, Dinas Road,						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (NON FOOD RETAIL) RCT/28/106 AS(N) 150 Ynys Field Site, Dinas Road, Trealaw SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
116.A148			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 945/ASN151						Land fronting Trebanog Road (Rhiw Garn Fawr)					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:			Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/141 AS(N) 55 Land south of The Ferns, Gilfach Goch RCT/28/205 AS(N) 151 Land fronting Trebanog Road, Trebanog SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A149			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 874/ASN152						Land south of Trebanog (Rhiw Garn Fawr)					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:			Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/206 AS(N) 152 Land south of Trebanog (Rhiw Garn Fawr), Trebanog RCT/28/207 AS(N) 153 Land adj to Rhiw Garn Fawr, Trebanog RCT/28/223 AS(N) 142 Land east of Hafod Wen and North of Concorde Drive, Tonyrefail RCT/28/228 AS(N) 145 Land at Trane Farm, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A150			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Document:		Site: 938/ASN153 Land adjacent to Rhiw Garn (Rhiw Garn Fawr)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/206 AS(N) 152 Land south of Trebanog (Rhiw Garn Fawr), Trebanog RCT/28/207 AS(N) 153 Land adj to Rhiw Garn Fawr, Trebanog RCT/28/223 AS(N) 142 Land east of Hafod Wen and North of Concorde Drive, Tonyrefail RCT/28/228 AS(N) 145 Land at Trane Farm, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A151			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Document:		Site: 947/ASN154 Land rear of Trebanog Road (Rhiw Garn Fawr)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/209 AS(N) 154 Land rear of Trebanog Road, Trebanog SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A152			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 981/ASN155 Land north of Rhiw Garn Fawr						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/211 AS(N) 155 land north of Rhiw Garn Fawr, Trebanog RCT/28/230 AS(N) 141 Land south of Gilfach Road, Tonyrefail SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Duffryn WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A153			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 923/ASN156 Land adjacent to St. Fagan's Vicarage						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/120 AS(N) 39 Land at Cefnpennar Road, Cwmbach RCT/28/137 AS(N) 70 Land to rear of Bute Terrace, Hirwaun RCT/28/174 AS(N) 156 Land adjacent to St Fagans, Tre cynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A154			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 968/ASN157 NSA 14.3 - Land at Former Mayhew Chicken Factory						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (MXED USE) RCT/28/175 AS(N) 157 Land at former Mayhew Chicken Factory, Trecynon SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A155			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 983/ASN158 Land at Treforest Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT) RCT/28/100 as(n) 119 Treforest Industrial Estate, Pontypridd RCT/28/101 AS(N) 120 & 158 Treforest Industrial Estate, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A156			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 906/ASN159 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATIONAL & ENERGY CENTRE) RCT/28/107 AS(N) 159 Land at Rhigos Road, Treherbert RCT/28/110 AS(N) 164 Land at Rhigos Road, Treherbert SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A157			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 919/ASN160 Former Stelco Hardy Factory						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/153 AS(N) 160 Former Stelco Hardy Factory, Treherbert SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>116.A158</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 920/ASN161 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/152 AS(N) 161 Land at Rhigos Road, Treherbert RCT/28/199 AS(N) 108 Land at allotments at Pantygraigwen Road, Pantygraigwen RCT/28/183 AS(N) 122 Land at Mount Pleasant, Porth SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

<b>116.A159</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1021/ASN162 Land at the end of Ynysfio Avenue, Treherbert						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (LEISURE AND RECREATION) RCT/28/108 AS(N) 162 Land at the end of Ynysfio Avenue, Treherbert RCT/28/109 AS(N) 163 Land at the end of Ynysfio Avenue, Treherbert SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>116.A160</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1016/ASN163						Land at the end of Ynysfio Avenue, Treherbert					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (LEISURE AND RECREATION) RCT/28/108 AS(N) 162 Land at the end of Ynysfio Avenue, Treherbert RCT/28/109 AS(N) 163 Land at the end of Ynysfio Avenue, Treherbert SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

<b>116.A161</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 855/ASN164						NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATIONAL & ENERGY CENTRE) RCT/28/107 AS(N) 159 Land at Rhigos Road, Treherbert RCT/28/110 AS(N) 164 Land at Rhigos Road, Treherbert SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A162			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 978/ASN165 Haigside Allotments, Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (ALLOTMENT & RELATED ACTIVITIES) RCT/28/111 AS(N) 165 Haigside Allotments, Rhigos Road, Treherbert RCT/28/113 AS(N) 168 Site opposite Ymyswen School, Trehorchy SEWERAGE We have no adverse comment for this site but depending on future proposals we would need to review and make further representation. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A163			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 980/ASN166 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (OPEN SPACE AND PLAY FACILITY) RCT/28/112 AS(N) 166 Old Hospital Site and School Place, Treherbert SEWERAGE We have no adverse comment for this site but depending on future proposals we would need to review and make further representation. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A164			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 912/ASN168 Site opposite Ymyswen Infants School						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (ALLOTMENT & RELATED ACTIVITIES) RCT/28/111 AS(N) 165 Haigside Allotments, Rhigos Road, Treherbert RCT/28/113 AS(N) 168 Site opposite Ymyswen School, Trehorchy SEWERAGE We have no adverse comment for this site but depending on future proposals we would need to review and make further representation. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A165			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 925/ASN169 Land to the north-east of Carne Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/126 AS(N) 169 Land to the north east of Carne Street, Treorchy RCT/28/128 AS(N) 172 Land at Tynebedw Terrace, Treorchy RCT/28/190 AS(N) 97 Land off Hospital Site, Llwynypia SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A166			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1003/ASN171 Former Burberry Factory						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (EMPLOYMENT) RCT/28/114 AS(N) 171 Former Burberry Factory, Treorchy SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. Where the proposed development will result in a new or amended trade effluent discharge, then the written approval of the sewerage undertaker is required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER Where it is proposed to utilise mains water for non-potable use, then please be advised that there is no obligation on a water undertaker to provide this water.

116.A167			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 927/ASN172 land at Tynybedw Terrace						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/126 AS(N) 169 Land to the north east of Carne Street, Treorchy RCT/28/128 AS(N) 172 Land at Tynebedw Terrace, Treorchy RCT/28/190 AS(N) 97 Land off Hospital Site, Llwynypia SEWERAGE Foul flows from this proposed development can be accommodated within the public sewerage system, however dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A168			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 895/ASN173 Land at Tyle Garw						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/157 AS(N) 173 Land at Tyle Garw SEWERAGE Development of these sites may be constrained by the performance of our public sewerage network for which there are no planned improvements within our current capital investment programme. Should this land be allocated for development then we would request that the allocation be released in the latter part of your Plan to allow us the time to undertake improvements or alternatively developers may need to fund the works in advance of our Regulatory requirement. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Coslech WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A169			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 937/ASN174 Site off Heol Llechau						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/130 AS(N) 176 Land t the west of Ynyshir, Ynyshir RCT/28/131 AS(N) 178 Land at Buarth y Capel, Ynyshywl RCT/28/184 AS(N) 174 Site off Heol Llechau, Wattstown RCT/28/181 AS(N) 121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A170			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 943/ASN175 Ynysboeth Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/176 AS(N) 175 Ynysboeth Estate, Ynysboeth SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. The proposed development site is crossed by a public sewer for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required. SEWAGE TREATMENT Our Cynon WwTW has limited capacity to accommodate all of the planned growth without further improvement. Our Capital Investment Programme (for the period 2010 - 2015) is currently being assessed by our Regulator and approval is expected in December 2009. However, the investment does not include this Works and we would request that our organisations meet to discuss and agree to a phased release of land in this area. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required. The proposed development site is crossed by a water main for which protection measures, either in the form of an easement and/or diversion may be required.

116.A171			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1002/ASN176 Land to the west of Ynyshir						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/130 AS(N) 176 Land t the west of Ynyshir, Ynyshir RCT/28/131 AS(N) 178 Land at Buarth y Capel, Ynysybwll RCT/28/184 AS(N) 174 Site off Heol Llechau, Wattstown RCT/28/181 AS(N) 121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
116.A172			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 922/ASN177 Lady Lewis Site (Rhondda LP allocation - ENV 11.20)						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (LAND RECLAMATION SCHEME) RCT/28/115 AS(N) 177 Lady Lewis Site, Ynyshir SEWERAGE We have no adverse comment for this site but depending on future proposals we would need to review and make further representation. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

116.A173			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 939/ASN178 Land at Buarth y Capel						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

DCWW LPA REF SITE NAME (RESIDENTIAL) RCT/28/130 AS(N) 176 Land t the west of Ynyshir, Ynyshir RCT/28/131 AS(N) 178 Land at Buarth y Capel, Ynysybwl RCT/28/184 AS(N) 174 Site off Heol Llechau, Wattstown RCT/28/181 AS(N) 121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion, Pontypridd SEWERAGE Our local public sewerage network will be unable to accommodate the demands from this substantial area. An hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to understand any potential improvements required. However dependant on the potential foul discharge flows the point of communication will have to be determined. SEWAGE TREATMENT Foul drainage from this proposed development will drain to Cardiff WwTW for which there are no problems in accepting the domestic demands. WATER A water supply can be made available to service the proposed development site. However, an assessment may be required, in particular for the larger densities, to understand the extent of off-site mains required.

138.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted in support.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>138.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 1026/ASS017	Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 3709 (iv) - Forestry Commission - Land off Blaenrhondda Road, Blaenrhondda.

<b>138.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 925/ASN169	Land to the north-east of Carne Street					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Additional information received SA/SEA and Habitat Assessment:

<b>138.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 927/ASN172	land at Tynybedw Terrace					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Additional information received SA/SEA and Habitat Assessment:

<b>138.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 1025/ASS082	Land to the North East of Carne Street					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Additional information received SA/SEA:

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>138.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1028/ASS083						Land at Tyn y Bedw Terrace				PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

---

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Additional information received SA/SEA:	

<b>195.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 996/ASN122						Land at Mount Pleasant				PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

---

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Land is too steep/unsuitable topography.  No need for residential development - other sites in the area have not come to fruition - Pleasant Heights II, Graid Ddu.  Increased traffic at junctions.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>195.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 940/ASN123 Large site off Llanwonno Road /Lady Lewis Tip						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
- 1) Lady Lewis inclusion dependant on another scheme to remove spoil/construct temporary road and this has many issues to overcome to be viable and officers feel that threat to public safety is of an issue therefore no need to remove spoil.
  - 2) Mountain is very steep therefore unsuitable topography.
  - 3) Area is 'medium' risk of landslip according to Halcrow best left undisturbed.
  - 4) Has now regenerated with vegetation/wildlife
  - 5) No housing need - other sites with planning approval have not come to fruition e.g. Pleasant Heights (II), Rear of Coronation Terrace, Graig Ddu.

<b>195.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 948/ASN124 Land off Hollybush Grove/Penrhiwgwynt Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
- Unsuitable topography - too steep.
  - Visual impact - from across the valley.
  - Unsuitable - would need cars to access site.
  - Very busy narrow streets to access this area - would cause too much traffic, especially at junctions.
  - Safety - 3 schools in the area.
  - Land stability - history of landslide in the 1970's.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>195.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 922/ASN177	Lady Lewis Site (Rhondda LP allocation - ENV 11.20					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Land has completely regenerated with vegetation and wildlife. Would scar mountainside. No risk to public safety at present - officer opinion - so no need.  
 Unsuitable access for any such site operation.  
 Disturbance would change water courses and increase flooding risk to houses below.

<b>198.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 925/ASN169	Land to the north-east of Carne Street					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 The land in question falls into two sections  
 1. The area to the North is currently occupied by two smallholders.  
 2. To the South is the Old Tynybedw Colliery site that was transformed in 1999 by the Forestry Commission into a superb recreational area where there is a great deal of wildlife. A series of ponds were created alongside a track ascending Moel Cadwgan (The Mountain). This is used by dozens of walkers daily who enjoy the exercise and superb views. The transformation of this site has been one of the success stories of recent years and its future should not be put in jeopardy by housing development.  
 Furthermore most of the site comprises of recovered spoil heap and two filled in colliery shafts resulting in land instability. The periferal area is on a steep slope - again unsuitable for building.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 Including this site would be a retrograde step from an environmental standpoint - P2 it would disregard other plans relating to healthy living, recreation, wildlife. C1 and C4 there are no good reasons for destroying a highly regarded facility - CE2 There has been no community involvement in nominating this site - P1 - P2 also applies.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>198.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1025/ASS082						Land to the North East of Carne Street				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The land in question falls into two sections

1. The area to the North is currently occupied by two smallholders.

2. To the South is the Old Tynybedw Colliery site that was transformed in 1999 by the Forestry Commission into a superb recreational area where there is a great deal of wildlife. A series of ponds were created alongside a track ascending Moel Cadwgan (The Mountain). This is used by dozens of walkers daily who enjoy the exercise and superb views. The transformation of this site has been one of the success stories of recent years and its future should not be put in jeopardy by housing development.

Furthermore most of the site comprises of recovered spoil heap and two filled in colliery shafts resulting in land instability. The periferal area is on a steep slope - again unsuitable for building.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Including this site would be a retrograde step from an environmental standpoint - P2 it would disregard other plans relating to healthy living, recreation, wildlife. C1 and C4 there are no good reasons for destroying a highly regarded facility - CE2 There has been no community involvement in nominating this site - P1 - P2 also applies.

<b>202.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 859/ASN005						Site B opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The road servicing these sites is already heavily congested by traffic. Tow inadequate bridges to the south of this site already cause great difficulties to vehicular movement. Park Street to the north is already experiencing traffic congestion. The above mentioned sites are outside the LDP residential settlement boundary.

By sticking to agreed res settlement boundaries.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

P1 P2 C4

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>241.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 844/ASN115 Pontygwaith Industrial Estate										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? As per my representations regarding the usage of this site and after extensive public consultation throughout the ward, I believe that this site should be allocated for mixed development usage.  The residents of Pontygwaith have advised us on numerous occasions that they would like to see housing or the land used for job creation to retain our young people in the community and to encourage young professionals to live and work in the area.  This would enhance further develop the regeneration of the area which has commenced with Phase 1 of the R.F.R.R and enhance the community with the retention and development of our young people.  As a strategic site, the proposed usage of this site is very important for the future development of our communities. 'Communities First' has had little impact but the correct allocation of this site would potentially see an increase in job creation, with more spending and an increase in the economic regeneration of the area.  It would also encourage private development and invetment; and the Local Authority is served well by strategic agencies that have vast experience in developing and delivering business start ups and expansion.  The Authority at present is also looking to consolidate sites and as such thish strategic site could be used by RCT to bring offices into the Rhondda Fach where they have no presence at present. For example the lease on Trevithick House in Cilfynydd is about to lapse and this site offers an ideal position for relocation with good road links and an adaptable labour force.  We want to encourage sustainability job creation, and to encourage enterprise agencies along with private investors to the area apart from the small site allocated for PRP Ltd, and only with a mixed development usage could this be achieved.  The development of this site for housing and or business usage would (baring in mind the above) not just improve the visual impact on the community but as a former industrial factory site which manufactured rubber goods would create a greener environment for the residents of the Tylorstown Ward.  By allocating the usage of the site for "mixed usage" it would, I believe, be greener or the community, have a positive visual impact on the community, encourage local enterprise, encourage sustainable job creation, encourage our young professionals to live in the community and also encourage all the expertise that the enterprise agencies can provide.  Therefore I believe that allocating the land for "mixed development" would serve the community better than any other type of restrictive allocation.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? By changing the proposed usage of this site to mixed usage it will greatly enhance the potential for development on this site not just by statutory bodies but also by private investors to further regenrate the area which is being evidenced due to the R.F.R.R by pass scheme.  The soundness of the LDP will be improved because the proposal mixed use development would be able to fully comply with Procedural Test P2, Consistency Tests C1, C2 and C3 and the Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>255.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 914/ASN043 Land adjacent to Alison House Community Centre						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The little used day centre was closed and replaced by a thriving youth centre with 200 members. The land adjoining the building was designated for development as an adventure playground. It will be of huge benefit to the young people and residents of the locality, having already reduced issues of anti-social behaviour.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Excellent use made of derelict land. Provision of recreational facilities in an area where they are badly needed.

<b>255.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
---------------	--	--	--------------------------	---	---	---	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Document:		Site: 912/ASN168 Site opposite Ynyswen Infants School						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We recommend the retention of this area and its development as a play area for the pupils of Ynyswen Infants and Ynyswen Welsh Primary School

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

There are over 450 children educated on the sites of these two with very limited outdoor play facilities.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>255.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 924/ASN170						Land at Prospect Green			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:			Issue:								
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

During the Mid Glamorgan era this site was allocated to the community and Treochy Riding School as a public open space, and has been in continuous use as such ever since. We are in full support of its development as a public play area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

An application for its inclusion and status as a Village Green has been submitted by local residents to the Council for approval.

**255.A4**

S W M






Document:

Site: 1003/ASN171 Former Burberry Factory

PEX Session:

Policy:

Map:

Issue:

Summary:

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The closure of this factory after providing employment for so many for more than 60 years was a devastating blow, especially given its manufacturing role.

As 40% of the working population already travel outside the area for their employment, this development is a must, and treated as a top priority. It has our full support.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

An urgent is to provide employment for local residents already suffering unemployment, and for those who are likely to be seeking work when the proposed housing developments have been completed.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>255.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 927/ASN172	land at Tynybedw Terrace					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

There are grave drainage problems emanating from this site affecting the properties of the residents of Tynybedw Terrace. There are also extremely difficult traffic problems in the terrace and adjoining Crosswood Street, which would be exacerbated by the proposed development. It is bounded by a wooded area supporting varied wildlife.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

P1. There has been no community involvement in selecting this site.  
 P2. Applies  
 C3. Increased in traffic problems  
 CE1  
 CE2

<b>255.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 1028/ASS083	Land at Tyn y Bedw Terrace					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

There are grave drainage problems emanating from this site affecting the properties of the residents of Tynybedw Terrace.

There are also extremely difficult traffic problems in the terrace and adjoining Crosswood Street., which would be exacerbated by the proposed development.

It is bounded by a wooded area supporting varied wildlife.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

P1. There has been no community involvement in selecting this site.  
 P2. Applies  
 C3. Increased in traffic problems  
 CE1  
 CE2

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>257.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 844/ASN115 Pontygwaith Industrial Estate								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was the former site of two factory units 1) Thatcher Rubber Moulding and 2) Rest Assured Bed Manufacturing site  Due to the construction of the Rhondda Fach Relief Road this site was reprofiled using inert wate material. Since the authority decided to pursue a replacement for the Local Plan in the form of the LDP I have continually requested that this site should be identified for either  a) Employment purposes or b) Mixed development whilst community enterprise concepts area laudable there is sufficient evidence to demonstarte that they area araely sustainable and are dependant upon grant aid to develop and bring these projects into being.  This site is quite significant in the Rhondda Fach in terms of being available for employment, there are few sites of this size in the Rhondda and as such it should be preserved for employment opportunities initiated by the private sector or enterprise agencies that have expertise in developing business.incubators start up units.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? By redesignating this site, preferably, for mixed development there is a clear opportunity to provide a sustinable development that will provide employment and housing opportunities. There should be a focus to providing facilities for new businesses through an enterprise agency such as "Business in Focus" or "Venture Wales". The housing ekements will meet the housing policies that form the emerging LDP. The provision of housing will help address the socio economic issues affecting the ward. (Tylorstown Ward is classed as the 11th most deprived in the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation).		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>259.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1034/ASS087						Land at Buarth y Capel			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? AS a local county councillor I strongly disagree with any development of the recreation ground, it is the only green field area in the village which has all our sporting facilities and children's park and strongly urge you to listen to the community of Ynysybwl	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The exclusion of the alternative site would improve the soundness of the LDP as it would give the community of Ynysybwl our recreation ground.		

<b>259.A2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Document:		Site: 939/ASN178						Land at Buarth y Capel			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? AS a local county councillor I strongly disagree with any development of the recreation ground, it is the only green field area in the village which has all our sporting facilities and children's park and strongly urge you to listen to the community of Ynysybwl	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The exclusion of the alternative site would improve the soundness of the LDP as it would give the community of Ynysybwl our recreation ground.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>313.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 843/ASN018 Land at Gwaun Miskin						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection centres around the Community Council belief that this area has important local significance for its wildlife and flora. It has a high value for nature conservation and is of interest for the enjoyment it affords to the community at large. It has been designated as a site of Importance for Nature Conservation. In the previous Local Plan (Taff Ely) the site was set aside to be managed as a nature reserve. The Community Council cannot see any reason why this should change and particularly not for the destruction of such a wonderful natural facility just to allow more residential development. The area is nearing residential saturation but has very few leisure facilities for the existing residents to enjoy.

<b>313.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 910/ASN095 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection is on the grounds of encroachment to the flood plain and would create a large intrusion into the countryside.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>313.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 911/ASN094						Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection is on the grounds of encroachment to the flood plain and would create a large intrusion into the countryside.

<b>313.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
---------------	--	--	--------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Document: Site: 1006/ASN092 Ystrad Barwig Isaf PEX Session:

Policy: Map: Issue:

Summary:

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection is on the grounds of encroachment to the flood plain and would create a large intrusion into the countryside.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>313.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 994/ASN093 Newtown Industrial Estate						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

In principle the inclusion of this site is supported by the Community Council for use as an industrial site. However the inclusion of the site for housing purposes would be opposed on the grounds that it would create a coalescence of settlements.

<b>313.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 916/ASN091 Land at Heol Creigiau						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The land is considered unsuitable for residential development because of the encroachment to the flood plain.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>313.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1110/ASS051						Edwards Coaches			PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

In principle the inclusion of this site is supported by the Community Council for use as an industrial site. However, the inclusion of the site for housing purposes would be opposed on the grounds that it would create a coalescence of settlements.

<b>313.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1001/ASN048						Land at Garth Farm			PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection is because this large area of land will add nothing to the amenities of the area. It will not benefit agricultural interests or the visual amenity of the area but will add to the traffic congestion of the minor roads of the area.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>313.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1111/ASS030						Land at Garth Farm			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection is because this large area of land will add nothing to the amenities of the area. It will not benefit agricultural interests or the visual amenity of the area but will add to the traffic congestion of the minor roads of the area.

<b>313.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 960/ASN053						Land adjacent to Meadow View, North			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection is because the development would not round off the existing established development. Instead it would create a spike into the countryside and give a future reason to extend the settlement boundary.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>313.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1105/ASS028 Land adjacent to Meadow View, north of Heol Dowlai						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:			Issue:										
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Community Council would like to make comments and objections to the following:

The Community Council of Llantwit Fardre object in the knowledge that the Local Development Plan, once adopted, will prescribe the land use for future planning applications and their subsequent determination. The ultimate objective of this body is to acknowledge that expansion is inevitable but to control the effect of this expansion on existing development, residents, road structure, the remaining countryside and to reduce the effect of urban/rural sprawl. The identification of settlement boundaries, the maintenance of settlement identities and prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The objection is because the development would not round off the existing established development. Instead it would create a spike into the countryside and give a future reason to extend the settlement boundary.

<b>332.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 926/ASN045 Land East of Aubery Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:			Issue:										
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The site is where Glynfach Allotment Society have their allotments and recently with Cymmer Junior School we have developed a 'Community Allotment' on the site. Each week around 20 students on average visit the plot and this area is the only site available not only for the school but for the wider community. For these reasons we would strongly object to any development in this area.

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
----------------------	--------------	------------------------

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

RCTCBC needs to take into account the local communities needs for green areas and a place where adults and young people of all ages can and do meet and support the local environment. The site needs to be excluded for all possible development.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>467.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Land South of Treherbert Road, Roundabout along Rhigos Road, Heads of the Valley Road, and Aberdare Road, to Tenant and includes the original Hirwaun Strategic Site.

Originally designated land for 'Mixed Use development' and mostly covering the area designated NSA 8- 'Hirwaun Strategic Site' The alternative site shows a large increase to the original site and includes additional residential use'

It was agreed that the Councils comments contained in the letter dated 16th March 2009 (Para 3.1 to 6.8), regarding the area shown as NSA 8 in the Draft Plan be also applied to the area included in the Alternative Site Register ASN No.64.

It is noted that the site is included in the Alternative Site Register (Ref.No. ASD No. 13 ) for 'deletion' of the site from the UDP and the Council supports this.

<b>467.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 907/ASN065 Hirwaun Ironworks, North Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Representation considered to be as per:

Hirwaun Ironworks North Site (Old Gloucester Tip) Virtually the old Gloucester Tip and beyond 'Cartref' bungalow and Ty Mawr House towards the rear of Fairview.

Originally designated land for residential development. Outline planning permission has already been granted in respect of this land. The only effect on his will be the outcome of the Village Green Application.

It was agreed that further action is not an option until, and if, a planning application is submitted.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>467.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 851/ASN066 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Land at Hirwaun. (Part of ASN No 64. above) From the Treherbert Road. Roundabout along Rhigos Rd., to Tower Rd. South up Tower Rd., and a straight line west across the Common through the Tower Colliery to Treherbert Rd.

For tourism, destination/green space.

Decision

It was agreed that whilst the area should be retained as green space it is noted that Alternative Site Register Ref. No ASS No. 47 marks the area for residential use and therefore the Council's comments contained in the letter dated 16th March 2009 (Para 3.1 to 6.8), regarding the area shown as NSA 8 in the Draft Plan be also applied to the area included in the Alternative Site Register ASN No. 66 and ASS No.47

<b>467.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 873/ASN067 Policy CS 9.2- Waste Management, Hirwaun Industri						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Entire site is on Hirwaun Industrial Estate.

Although the Council has formerly objected to this development (Letter dated 12/10/07) only a small part of the site is in Hirwaun and Penderyn Community Council area.

Decision

It was decided that (a) there are already adequate re-cycling facilities in the area operating at the Amgen Re-cycling Centre, Bryn Pica Site, Dyllas, Llwydcoed. (b) there is no need for a business park in the area. There are empty industrial units on the Hirwaun Industrial Estate and more than sufficient open land to construct purpose built units on the same site. (c) The extra pollution caused by the operating plant and the increased volume of traffic would be detrimental to the environment.

It is noted that the site is included in the Alternative Site Register (Ref. No. ASD No.14) for 'deletion' of the site from the LDP and the Council supports this. (See letter dated 12/10/07)

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>467.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 907/ASN065						Hirwaun Ironworks, North Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Further to my letter dated 13th July 2009, it is understood that the Public Inquiry into the Application to Grant Village Green Status to Land to the West of Broniestyn Tce. Hirwaun, has resulted in the application being granted.

The land is referred to in the Alternative Site Register as ASN No. 65 Hirwaun Ironworks North Site and is shown as designated for residential use.

In view of the decision to grant village green status to the land, it is requested that current proposals to designate the area as 'residential use' be withdrawn and re-designated as 'open space and leisure'.

<b>490.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 852/ASN028						Golf Course Site, Brynna Road			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The site / settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
RCT's Professional Officer Views.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>490.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 862/ASN029 Land South of Brynna Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? RCT's Professional Officer Views.		

<b>490.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 903/ASN030 Brynna West						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site/ settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? RCT's Professional Officers Views.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>490.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 904/ASN049 Land south of Heol Iscoed						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
RCT's professional officer views.

<b>490.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1009/ASN079 Land east of The Bungalow, Llantrisant Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
RCT's professional officer views.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>490.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1000/ASN080 Land east of The Bungalow, Llantrisant Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? RCT's professional officer views.		

<b>490.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 999/ASN081 Fomer Llanharan Sewerage Treatment Works						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? RCT's professional officer views.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>490.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 878/ASN082 Land at the cricket field						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
RCT's professional officer views.

<b>490.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1024/ASS018 Brynna West						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial Examination of the candidate sites.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
RCT's professional officer views.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>490.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 1102/ASS092	Rhyd Lethin					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site/settlement boundary amendment should be rejected in accordance with RCT's initial examination of the candidate sites.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
RCT's professional officer views

<b>564.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 1008/ASN084	Land at Elms Farm					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Green Wedge of land should remain to separate the communities of Llanharry and Brynsadler. Non residential development along this road would be undesirable and would result in more pressure on an overburdened infrastructure in the area.

<b>564.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 987/ASN085	Land to the north of Llanharry					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The Council objects to the allocation of this site to residential development because it would cause more pressure to an already cracking infrastructure. There appears to be no road access to the site and the site has a history of subsidence and flooding.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>564.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1012/ASN086 Land at The Elms, Llanharry						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The Council objects to the application on environmental grounds, this area abounds with many verities of flora and fauna, including rare birds.

<b>564.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1179/ASD015 SSA 10.13 - West of Llechau						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? No  
We support the deletion of this site, as it is totally unsuitable for development.

<b>564.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 895/ASN173 Land at Tyle Garw						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
My Council objects to this site being proposed for residential use as the infrastructure in the area is unable to cope with further developments, particularly the roads, and would result in overdevelopment of the area.  
The land in question is well used as a recreational area and supports a wide variety of flora and fauna.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>564.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1106/ASS084						Land at Tyle Garw			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This site should remain outside the settlement boundary to ensure no further development in an already over-developed area, where the infrastructure is already creaking with the existing development. The retention of this site as an area of recreation and natural interest is a must.

<b>564.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1095/ASS050						Land to the north of The Patch			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Site is an area of historic interest, there are tumulus in an adjacent field and the site of the bronze age beaker man is also in the adjacent field. We feel this should remain outside the settlement boundary.

<b>564.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1095/ASS050						Land to the north of The Patch			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Site of historic interest, adjacent field has tumulus and was the site of bronze age beaker man. We think this site should remain outside the settlement boundary.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>564.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1047/ASS097 West of Llechau						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
We support the deletion of this site as it is totally unsuitable for development.

<b>580.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 846/ASN040 Land at Crichton Farm						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
I am writing in relation to the consultation on the above new site which appears on the Local Development Plan Alternative Site Register which covers Cwmbach. I have visited the site and wish to make the following observations:-

The area is one of natural beauty and of recreational and educational benefit to local residents. Previously a site showing the scars of industrial activity, it now has established woods of broad-leaf trees and a diverse habitat and encouraging a wide variety of wildlife. Currently it acts as a very well used and valued green area for the community of Cwmbach.

Plans to remove the disused tips means a total transformation of the site, loss of trees and habitat and, not least, many months of dust and the noise of excavation and transportation of spoil.

I should be grateful if you would consider these points when weighing up responses to the consultation process.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>604.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 843/ASN018						Land at Gwaun Miskin			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	On behalf of the Woodlands residents I object, most strongly, to the development AS(N)18 - Land at Gwaunmiskin which includes Nant-myddlyn woods. This application should be resisted at all costs. Nant Myddlyn should be set aside for a mature reserve. Well documented bird life includes: Sparrow Hawks Woodcock Tawny and White Owls Woodpeckers and BATS!! = PROTECTED SPECIES  Another was recorded/sited in 1990 There are newts, marsh fritillary butterflies and of course these are priority, protected species. Documentation provided by Nigel Lewis, Chief Conservation Officer- Glamorgan Naturalists, RCT and Pencoed College	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	P1		
	P2		
	C1		
	C4		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>735.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 863/ASN143 St. Johns The Baptist's Church								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The churchyard has been a problem for around 25 years with vandalism, dumping of rubbish, pest control notices, Japanese Knotweed and, in recent years, drug needles. Efforts to tidy the area have been made but without success. The graveyard served the community of Tonyrefail until Trane Cemetery and, in the past, the parochial Church Council has made enquiries of the Town and County Councils for help or to take over management: The small congregation doesn't have the extensive resources needed to cope with such a difficult problem. Since 2005, the current Vicar has secured help for maintenance from community service workers but this has stopped because of the health risks associated with needles. The knotweed is being treated but, in the long term, the current situation cannot continue as it is detrimental to the amenities of the area. Without substantial grant assistance or local authority management of the site, the only feasible option is to sell the site for residential use. The costs involved in achieving this are substantial and will only just be covered by the value inherent in such use. Historically, it has been recognised that clearance of the site is necessary; planning permission for 18 residential units was granted in 1985 and, subsequently, the site was zoned for residential use in the Taff Ely Local Plan Deposit Draft 1996, policy H1. In 2000, outline planning permission was granted upon appeal, the inspector noting that there was no realistic alternative way of improving the site and preventing the problems that had been experienced. RCT Development and Regeneration has written to the owner on a number of occasions for an update on the timescale for development in accordance with Policy H1, most recently in 2007. Flexibility is needed to permit a satisfactory outcome to be achieved for the future of this site and it therefore is inappropriate to remove the designation for residential use in the emerging LDP. It is a residential area and provide useful contribution to housing provision.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>The LDP should take into account the historical difficulties of this site and include sufficient provision for it to be improved for the benefit of the local community. No consultation has taken place with the local parochial church council to consider options for the future of the site and the viabilities of each option. Without this, it is difficult to assess whether the LDP will meet the CE2 test for this area. It is also questionable whether the LDP meets the CE3 and CE4 in enabling a proper and beneficial consideration of the future of the site.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1015.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1074/ASS086 Large area of land to the west of Ynyshir										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>Cae Siriol has a five year history of land/fill eater problems which as of yet has not been 100% clarified as satisfactory. Also issues with environment such as protected wildlife/pondlife. Also there is a sizeable portfolio regarding issues with the owner of the land which has led to numerous meetings with high profile Council members trying to solve issues created by the owner which in the resident's view would only be amplified should the land be regarded as suitable for development. The portfolio can be viewed by your site surveyor at this/her convenience by contacting myself. Below are some ref. No of some correspondence between myself and r.c.t.</p> <p>Ref.mand01001/01070156 5/6/07                      Pk/e051r(3)/15768 23/10/06                      E051r/dhr 17/1/06                      En/06/00426 6/10/06                      Pk/e051r(3) 15716 9/10/06</p> <p>For your notes the following persons have been involved with our issues.                      JANE COOK (SERVICE DIRECTOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL)                      SHEILA DAVIES (DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT REGENERATION)                      KEITH WARREN (DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT REGENERATION)                      P KONOPIELKO (LAND RECLAMATION)                      DAVID JACOBS (PLANNING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER)                      GEORGE JONES (ACTING GROUP DIRECTOR)                      CHRIS BRYANT                      LIONEL LANGFORD</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require photo evidence of these issues.</p> <p>If this site were included in the ldp, the natural beauty of the land and views would be destroyed, Walk paths would no longer be available.the natural drainage of the land (mountain water) is already a problem and would be made considerably worse for the residents of Cae Siriol.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>If the site were included in the ldp,the natural beauty of the land and views would be destroyed,Walk paths would no longer be available.the natural drainage of the land (mountain water) is already a problem and would be made considerably worse for the residents of Cae Siriol.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1053.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 953/ASN011 Cwm Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Cwm Farm is a 20 acre self contained greenfield site located on the south west boundary of Aberdare. Please see attached plan.  The site has good access provision direct from Monk Street. Previously, Forward Planning Officers raised concern that the site had access constraints which prohibited the delivery of the site.  Redrow have investigated who owns the access road and have developed an access solution, in conjunction with RCT Highways Officers. There has now been an agreement in principle from RCT Highways Officers to the design. The design is based on the site accommodating over 100 dwellings.  It is proposed to carry out improvements to the existing access road and develop a direct and improved Public Transport, cycle and footpath link into Cwm Dare Country Park, which in turn will increase the number of visitors into the park.  In comparison to rival sites Aberdare, the site is gently sloping and there are no constraints on development. Redrow control the land and intend on developing as soon as practicable.  The fact that the site is so well contained means that the visual impact of the proposed development is minimal. The development would only be visible from the immediate boundaries of the site. Redrow would propose to preserve as many of the existing trees as possible and incorporate them into the scheme, thereby creating a rural feel to the proposal.  The site is in a sustainable location, with excellent pedestrian/cycle links to Aberdare town centre and other facilities. Redrow intends on improving the town centre link to the site and country park. Redrow will also enhance the public transport network as part of our overall development proposals.  At present RCT have no greenfield site allocations within Aberdare. The sites that are currently being promoted were included in the previous local plan and were not viable (due to abnormal development costs) for re-development during the boom period of the property market, and therefore not deliverable. There is no suggestion that the situation will be different this time round, particularly with development and site clearance costs being greater now than previous years. The LPA are therefore encouraged to consider allowing development at Cwm Farm.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Cwm Farm should be included for residential development as an alternative site within the plan as the site is available for development now and Redrow (as developer) control the land.  Core Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy states that the Council "admit that the availability of developable brownfield land in RCT is a finite resource and it is clear that it cannot accommodate the growth requirements of the County Borough. The development of brownfield and greenfield land will therefore be necessary to the strategy of the plan"  CE" - The proposed allocations do not take into account the development viability of the proposed candidate sites and where appropriate the plan should consider allocating greenfield sites in Aberdare, should it be considered that they would represent a more logical development approach. Implementing the changes within this representation would assist in ensuring this soundness is met.  CE4 - The policy contravenes CE4 as it is not sufficiently flexible enough to allow for situations where the viability of a site clearly results in that site not coming forward. The majority of allocations in Aberdare are now on brownfield land and the deliverability of these sites is questionable. Therefore, it is not considered that the policy is flexible to accommodate the fact that sites may not be viable proposals and unlikely to be developed.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1053.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1170/ASD006 SSA 10.12 - Land East of Dolau County Primary School, Bridgend Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	Yes	
<p>Redrow fully support the allocation of site SSA12 in the RCT Local development Plan for residential development. The site should be treated independently to adjoining development.</p> <p>The site can be accessed independently of the adjoining Llanilid regeneration site and this access has been approved by RCT Highways Department (Please see copy e-mail confirmation attached). A copy of the approved Highway scheme is also attached.</p> <p>Forward Planning Officer's comments that the existing access is not suitable as a principle means of access are not justified and were not subject to discussion with the Highways Department prior to publication of the plan. It is not considered appropriate to have to secure access through the Llanilid Strategic Site as there are 3rd party issues to overcome, which in turn will restrict the deliverability of the site.</p> <p>In Redrow's opinion, providing an independent access to the proposed development is key to integrating the site with the existing settlement and street scene, without turning its back onto Bridgend Road, which would be the consequence of it becoming a part of Llanilid.</p> <p>The indicative master plan submitted as part of Redrow's current application demonstrates how the site could be developed, with an approved highways access and concept layout.</p> <p>Being an infill site within the settlement boundary, the site relates well to the existing built form. This is a site that is owned by Redrow, who are committed to delivering the site as soon as planning permission is obtained, thereby assisting the delivery of new housing to support the 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>The LPA have evidence to support the initial allocation and need for this site in Llanharan, as part of their growth strategy for this area of the County. This is a sustainable site with excellent community facilities within walking distance, and good public transport facilities on a daily basis.</p>			

2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
<p>The inclusion of the site is crucial to meeting the strategy of the plan, in particular policies SSA6 and SSA1", which encourage new residential development in Llanharan and on this site in particular.</p> <p>Redrow would encourage that this site remains within the settlement boundary as an independent, and that the Council accept that an independent access is the best solution for this site to ensure its delivery within the next 5 years.</p>			

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1318.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 885/ASN060 Land adjacent to Craig yr Hesg Quarry, Pontypridd						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Yes

Land to the north-west of Craig yr Hesg Quarry is identified in the Deposit Draft version of the LDP as a 'Preferred Area of Know Mineral Resource' (Policy SSA 26), where the supporting text highlights the importance of the quarry as a source of high specification Pennant Sandstone which is in high demand (para 6.187). The text further notes that the South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party 'Regional Technical Statement' identifies the need to allocate additional reserves in Rhonda Cynon Taf to ensure a supply of resources over the period of the LDP (para 6.188).

The allocation has progressed through a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as part of the evidence base of the Plan, and has emerged in the Draft LDP as the only allocation for future quarrying.

It is noted that numerous representations have been submitted in response to the Deposit Draft which seek to promote an alternative allocation for the site and, specifically, to remove the 'Preferred Area of Know Mineral Resource' and to replace it by the allocation of a 'community/amenity area'. Various reasons are cited in support of this change, including comments on the proximity of the area to residential property, and the noise, blast vibration, dust and general disturbance which might arise from quarrying within the allocated area.

In promoting an alternative site, it is the responsibility of those seeking changes to provide the necessary evidence to demonstrate that the Plan would be sound if the site were to be allocated for the alternative use and, in this case, to demonstrate that the Plan would remain sound if the mineral resource allocation were to be deleted. This needs to include evidence that the change would be compatible with the SA and SEA (ref Assembly Policy on Preparation of LDPs: December 2005, para 4.26, and the Assembly LDP Manual June 2006, paras 7.52 and 8.4.4).

In response to the proposed alternative site allocation, we make the following comments:

(i) The Deposit Draft LDP, via Policy SSA 26 and the supporting evidence base and SA/SEA has concluded that the land needs to be allocated for the extraction of Pennant Sandstone, and that in land use and broad environmental terms the area is suitable and appropriate for quarrying.

(ii) The representations which have been submitted in support of the alternative allocation do not seek to counter this evidence base, nor are they supported by an SA/SEA in support of the alternative use.

(iii) There should be no changes to the Plan in the absence of evidence to demonstrate whether the Plan would satisfy the tests of soundness of the Plan if the requested changes are made.

(iv) In practice, the deletion of the mineral resource allocation (SSA 26) would make the Plan manifestly unsound given that (a) the Plan acknowledges a need to release additional mineral resources (where part of the evidence base confirms that Pennant Sandstone is a resource of national importance); and (b) the only allocation identified to meet the requirement is the mineral resource allocation adjoining Craig yr Hesg Quarry. A change to replace the current allocation would also be wholly inconsistent with the underlying principle of Policy CS10 in terms of ensuring a continuous supply of minerals and maintaining a 20 year landbank of reserves.

(v) The various quarrying environmental /amenity issues referred to in the representations in support of the alternative allocation are matters that can and will be addressed as part of an environmental impact assessment (EIA) which will be undertaken in support of an application for an extension to the quarry within the allocated area. In that respect it is noteworthy that the mineral resource allocation is akin to a 'preferred area' (ref MPPW para 14) rather than a 'specific site' with defined boundaries. In these circumstances, the limits of extraction and buffer zones etc will be defined as part of the EIA process, and the environmental /amenity issues which have been highlighted will be considered as part of that process at the development control /planning application stage. They are not issues which are appropriate for detailed scrutiny as part of the LDP process.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<i>Item Question</i>										<i>Reply</i>						<b>Soundness Tests</b>

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The current allocation of the land for quarrying (Policy SSA 26) should remain, subject to the minor changes suggested in the representations submitted by Hanson in response to the Deposit Draft (ref White Young Green 26 March 2009).

The suggested alternative site would be detrimental to the soundness of the Plan, as it fails a number of the required tests, most notably:

It fails the procedural test (P2) in that it has not been subject to a SA and SEA;

It fails the consistency tests C1 and C2, being inconsistent with wider policies of the Deposit Draft Plan (notably CS10); the Regional Technical Statement; and with MPPW and MTAN1, with the requirement for LDPs to make allocations to provide for the future supply of minerals.

It further fails the tests of coherence and effectiveness in that the alternative allocation would not stem from a coherent strategy (as is the case with the mineral strategy CS10) and associated allocation (SSA 26), but rather is would be a piecemeal, ad-hoc allocation which appears to be designed to compromise and frustrate the coherent mineral strategy (Test CE1). It is also not compatible with the Development Plans prepared by neighbouring authorities, which are based upon a collective approach to future aggregate supplies and shared contributions advocated by the Regional Technical Statement.

It also fails test CE2 in that the alternative allocation is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1318.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1174/ASD010 Land adjacent to Craig yr Hesg Quarry, Pontypridd is identified as a Preferred Area of Known Mineral Resource						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

-----  

Item Question	Representation Text
---------------	---------------------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Yes

Land to the north-west of Craig yr Hesg Quarry is identified in the Deposit Draft version of the LDP as a 'Preferred Area of Know Mineral Resource' (Policy SSA 26), where the supporting text highlights the importance of the quarry as a source of high specification Pennant Sandstone which is in high demand (para 6.187). The text further notes that the South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party 'Regional Technical Statement' identifies the need to allocate additional reserves in Rhonda Cynon Taf to ensure a supply of resources over the period of the LDP (para 6.188).

The allocation has progressed through a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as part of the evidence base of the Plan, and has emerged in the Draft LDP as the only allocation for future quarrying.

It is noted that numerous representations have been submitted in response to the Deposit Draft which seek to promote an alternative allocation for the site and, specifically, to remove the 'Preferred Area of Know Mineral Resource' and to replace it by the allocation of a 'community/amenity area'. Various reasons are cited in support of this change, including comments on the proximity of the area to residential property, and the noise, blast vibration, dust and general disturbance which might arise from quarrying within the allocated area.

In promoting an alternative site, it is the responsibility of those seeking changes to provide the necessary evidence to demonstrate that the Plan would be sound if the site were to be allocated for the alternative use and, in this case, to demonstrate that the Plan would remain sound if the mineral resource allocation were to be deleted. This needs to include evidence that the change would be compatible with the SA and SEA (ref Assembly Policy on Preparation of LDPs: December 2005, para 4.26, and the Assembly LDP Manual June 2006, paras 7.52 and 8.4.4).

In response to the proposed alternative site allocation, we make the following comments:

(i)  The Deposit Draft LDP, via Policy SSA 26 and the supporting evidence base and SA/SEA has concluded that the land needs to be allocated for the extraction of Pennant Sandstone, and that in land use and broad environmental terms the area is suitable and appropriate for quarrying.

(ii)  The representations which have been submitted in support of the alternative allocation do not seek to counter this evidence base, nor are they supported by an SA/SEA in support of the alternative use.

(iii)  There should be no changes to the Plan in the absence of evidence to demonstrate whether the Plan would satisfy the tests of soundness of the Plan if the requested changes are made.

(iv)  In practice, the deletion of the mineral resource allocation (SSA 26) would make the Plan manifestly unsound given that (a) the Plan acknowledges a need to release additional mineral resources (where part of the evidence base confirms that Pennant Sandstone is a resource of national importance); and (b) the only allocation identified to meet the requirement is the mineral resource allocation adjoining Craig yr Hesg Quarry. A change to replace the current allocation would also be wholly inconsistent with the underlying principle of Policy CS10 in terms of ensuring a continuous supply of minerals and maintaining a 20 year landbank of reserves.

(v)  The various quarrying environmental /amenity issues referred to in the representations in support of the alternative allocation are matters that can and will be addressed as part of an environmental impact assessment (EIA) which will be undertaken in support of an application for an extension to the quarry within the allocated area. In that respect it is noteworthy that the mineral resource allocation is akin to a 'preferred area' (ref MPPW para 14) rather than a 'specific site' with defined boundaries. In these circumstances, the limits of extraction and buffer zones etc will be defined as part of the EIA process, and the environmental /amenity issues which have been highlighted will be considered as part of that process at the development control /planning application stage. They are not issues which are appropriate for detailed scrutiny as part of the LDP process.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
Item Question										Reply	Soundness Tests			

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The current allocation of the land for quarrying (Policy SSA 26) should remain, subject to the minor changes suggested in the representations submitted by Hanson in response to the Deposit Draft (ref White Young Green 26 March 2009).

The suggested alternative site would be detrimental to the soundness of the Plan, as it fails a number of the required tests, most notably:

It fails the procedural test (P2) in that it has not been subject to a SA and SEA;

It fails the consistency tests C1 and C2, being inconsistent with wider policies of the Deposit Draft Plan (notably CS10); the Regional Technical Statement; and with MPPW and MTAN1, with the requirement for LDPs to make allocations to provide for the future supply of minerals.

It further fails the tests of coherence and effectiveness in that the alternative allocation would not stem from a coherent strategy (as is the case with the mineral strategy CS10) and associated allocation (SSA 26), but rather is would be a piecemeal, ad-hoc allocation which appears to be designed to compromise and frustrate the coherent mineral strategy (Test CE1). It is also not compatible with the Development Plans prepared by neighbouring authorities, which are based upon a collective approach to future aggregate supplies and shared contributions advocated by the Regional Technical Statement.

It also fails test CE2 in that the alternative allocation is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.

**1334.A1**

S

M





Document:

Site: 904/ASN049 Land south of Heol Iscoed

PEX Session:

Policy:

Map:

Issue:

Summary:

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The proposed alternative site adjoins a well established and mature residential development and is quite central to the village. There is existing good road access as well as access to all main services. The proposed site is quite flat and this easy to develop. A good and wide range of mixed housing could be provided on the site

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The inclusion of the site could help to address the housing needs of the area so as to be sympathetic to the environment.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1353.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 867/ASN036	Land North of Pantglas Farm, Coedely					PEX Session:	
Policy:							Map:		Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence.

<b>1353.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 999/ASN081	Fomer Llanharan Sewerage Treatment Works					PEX Session:	
Policy:							Map:		Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence.

<b>1353.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 987/ASN085	Land to the north of Llanharry					PEX Session:	
Policy:							Map:		Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence,

<b>1353.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 1012/ASN086	Land at The Elms, Llanharry					PEX Session:	
Policy:							Map:		Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1353.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 984/ASN105 Land at Mwyndy Quarry						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence.

<b>1353.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
----------------	--	--	--------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Document:		Site: 1179/ASD015 SSA 10.13 - West of Llechau						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Yes  
Objection is made to the proposed deletion of deposit plan allocation number SSA10.13.

The site relates well to existing built-up limits and it is submitted that the allocation should be retained to help meet the dwelling requirement in this part of the Borough.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
It is submitted that the site should be allocated for residential development under the provision of policy SSA10.13 of the Deposit Plan. The proposed allocation is realistic and appropriate and its allocation would help secure a robust LDP policy base thus meeting the requirements of Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE2.

The allocation of the site would also be compatible with the provisions of National Policy set out in Ministerial Interim Planning Policy statement 01/2006, which seeks to secure an adequate housing land supply in locations people want to live and consequently would also meet the requirement of Consistency Test C2.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1353.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1190/ASD026 SSA 8 - Mwyndy / Talbot Green						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	Yes	
<p>Objection is made to the proposed deletion of site SSA8. The site is allocated in the Deposit Plan for the construction of comprehensive mixed development including residential, employment, retail, leisure, a primary school, library/community facility and informal amenity space in a landscaped setting.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would consolidate urban form, strengthen the status of Llantrisant/Talbot Green as a principal settlement and provide a major boost to the local economy.</p> <p>It is submitted that the Deposit Plan allocation should be retained.</p>			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
<p>It is submitted that policy SSA8 of the Deposit Plan is realistic and appropriate and its retention would help secure a robust LDP policy base thus meeting the requirements of Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE.</p>			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1370.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 842/ASN109 Land at House O "The Trees"						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?		
<p>Please see attached Self Assessment Form fir the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.</p>			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
<p>The inclusion of the sites wouls assist in meeting cohercnce and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.</p>			



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1400.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 969/ASN147 Land off Mill Street						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

---

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
Additional information received SA/SEA and Habitat Assessment:	

<b>1400.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1073/ASS074 Land off Mill Street						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

---

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
Additional information received SA/SEA:	

<b>1400.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1198/ASD034 SSA 10.6 - Land east of Mill Street, Tonyrefail						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

---

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	Yes
Objection is made to the proposed deletion of Deposit Plan Allocation SSA 10.6 -. The site should be retained as it will contribute to the range and choice of housing sites in Tonyrefail, and reinforce the role of Tonyrefail within the Southern Strategy Area.	

---

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
The site should be allocated for development under the provisions of Policy SSA 10.6. The proposed allocation is realistic and appropriate and its allocation would help to secure a robust LDP policy base, thus meeting the requirements of the Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE2.		
The allocation of the site would also be compatible with the provision of National Policy set out in the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006, which seeks to secure an adequate housing land supply in locations people want to live and consequently the proposal would also meet the requirements of Consistency Test C2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1400.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1199/ASD035						SSA 15.3 - Land east of Mill Street, Tonyrefail				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question													Representation Text	
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?								Yes				
Objection is made to the proposed deletion of the Deposit Plan Allocation SSA 15.3. The site should be retained as it will contribute and reinforce the provision of enhanced retail facilities in the Southern Strategy Area.														

Item Question													Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?												
The site should be allocated for retail development under the provisions of Policy SSA 15.3. The proposed allocation is realistic and appropriate and its allocation would help secure a robust LDP policy base, thus meeting the requirements of the coherence and Effectiveness test CE2.														

<b>1401.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1181/ASD017						NSA 9.4 - Site including the old brickworks, old dairy and tipped land rear of Birchwood				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question													Representation Text	
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?								Yes				
Representation 2070.10 D appears to cast doubt upon the deliverability of the forecast Housing Numbers set against the Candidate/Allocation.														
It is clear from the attached photography taken 26th February 2007 that the land is not densely covered with trees and is well suited for linked development and not restricted by the presence of trees.														
Existing comments demonstrate that housing numbers envisaged can be achieved in accordance with the relevant strategies.														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1403.A1</b>	0		<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1072/ASS034 North of Ty Coch, Heathlands						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Please find enclosed a plan of amendment to my original application. This amendment requests the existing boundary line to be continued on its present line to the lane. This would then not require the existing diversion as at present. I would be prepared to except this amendment if acceptable.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Under item CE4 in that the plan is not being flexible to accommodate a property to be built behind my mother's house.

<b>1403.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1072/ASS034 North of Ty Coch, Heathlands						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

It is mt opinion that by making a slight variation to the existing local boundry, amounting to approximately 20m. It would be possible to erect a residential proerty adjacent to my mothers property.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

under item CE4 in that the plan is not being flexible to accommodate a property to be built behind my mothers house.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1424.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 939/ASN178 Land at Buarth y Capel						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  

Item	Question	Representation Text
------	----------	---------------------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Congestion of Traffic

Major issue - The road network within the village with its on street parking policy, is currently a major safety hazard for both vehicles and pedestrians. Currently drivers through their frustrations with the congested roads are already taking alternative routes through the side streets increasing safety problems further.

The substantial increase in traffic flows from this proposed development would further exacerbate the traffic problems and produce an increased risk to the safety of the village residents.

Safeguarding the natural environment e.g. S.I.N.C. Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The protection of this site from the proposed development is fully appropriate and warranted. The Council (who represent their public) need to have fully respected the need to retain this important nature conservation & special landscape area that the proposed development would take away from the character of the village.

The removal of public allotments - The removal of these will the (sic) eradicate the community interaction that these facilities have encouraged for many generations; together with the healthy eating and healthy life style working these gardens have promoted.

Removal of an ecologically important area of open space; to the detriment of physical and mental health of the local residents a theory, which is supported by the government strategy of healthy living.

Public Utilities

Sewerage network and culverts - The current network of sewers and culverts surcharge and flood in time of heavy rain; it is therefore going to flood at more frequent intervals and with increased impact on the local residents if this development is allowed to proceed.

Lady Windsor Brownfield Site is ready and is currently being promoted as a mix use site combining residential, education, community and workshop facilities.

Its location is close to the centre of the village making it easy for pedestrian access (The location of the proposed site will encourage additional traffic flows because of its remote location).

The Lady Windsor Site would provide the perfect opportunity to introduce a bypass road around the heart of the village to assist in reducing the traffic load in the centre of the village and reduce the risk to both vehicles and pedestrians using them.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1424.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1034/ASS087						Land at Buarth y Capel			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p><b>Congestion of Traffic</b>                      Major issue - The road network within the village with its on street parking policy, is currently a major safety hazard for both vehicles and pedestrians. Currently drivers through their frustrations with the congested roads are already taking alternative routes through the side streets increasing safety problems further.                      The substantial increase in traffic flows from this proposed development would further exacerbate the traffic problems and produce an increased risk to the safety of the village residents.</p> <p>Safeguarding the natural environment e.g. S.I.N.C. Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The protection of this site from the proposed development is fully appropriate and warranted. The Council (who represent their public) need to have fully respected the need to retain this important nature conservation &amp; special landscape area that the proposed development would take away from the character of the village.</p> <p>The removal of public allotments - The removal of these will the (sic) eradicate the community interaction that these facilities have encouraged for many generations; together with the healthy eating and healthy life style working these gardens have promoted.</p> <p>Removal of an ecologically important area of open space; to the detriment of physical and mental health of the local residents a theory, which is supported by the government strategy of healthy living.</p> <p><b>Public Utilities</b>                      Sewerage network and culverts - The current network of sewers and culverts surcharge and flood in time of heavy rain; it is therefore going to flood at more frequent intervals and with increased impact on the local residents if this development is allowed to proceed.</p> <p>Lady Windsor Brownfield Site is ready and is currently being promoted as a mix use site combining residential, education, community and workshop facilities.                      Its location is close to the centre of the village making it easy for pedestrian access (The location of the proposed site will encourage additional traffic flows because of its remote location).</p> <p>The Lady Windsor Site would provide the perfect opportunity to introduce a bypass road around the heart of the village to assist in reducing the traffic load in the centre of the village and reduce the risk to both vehicles and pedestrians using them.</p>	

<b>1437.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1078/ASS069						Land at Talygarn			PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:			Issue:										
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	Additional information received SA/SEA:	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>1437.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1018/ASN137 Land at Talygarn						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Additional information received SA/SEA:	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>1465.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
1	3 - 4			Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?											
<p>Tower Colliery has previously made a representation in support of changes to NSA 8 and promoted AS (N) 64. That evidence has already been submitted to the Council.</p> <p>In principle, we support Policy NSA 8 as a Strategic Site in order to deliver employment and residential land within the LDP area. However, we consider the wording of the policy in the LDP Deposit Draft and the inclusion of an Indicative Concept Plan with specific land use allocations is too prescriptive at this stage in the development design process, and has directly led to a number of specific representations opposing the proposals. Through AS (N) 64 we are seeking to extend the NSA 8 boundary to include the whole of the Tower Colliery site which will become available for development.</p> <p>With reference to our previous representations, we believe that given the large-scale nature of the site a more flexible, co-ordinated and comprehensive approach to its future development form is required. To ensure that, we believe that a reasonable approach would be to give the site a more generic allocation as a Strategic Site which, prior to the development phase progressing, will require the preparation of a Development Framework. This will allow for a more comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of the site given the long timeframe. This approach underlines our clients' desire for a co-ordinated approach to the comprehensive restoration of the whole site which can realise opportunities to enhance public access, and cultural or ecological features and incorporate them into specific Design Framework proposals.</p> <p>The boundary of the Strategic Site developed in Policy NSA8 should be extended, as illustrated in our previous representations, to reflect the potential opportunities for the redevelopment of the whole site. The opportunity exists to incorporate the allocation of land uses, which have not been included in Policy NSA 8, within the Development Framework site such as: open space; leisure; and heritage based tourism on the extended site. The current alignment and predetermined internal boundaries constitute unnecessary spatial constraints on the comprehensive and sensitive development of the site.</p> <p>The proposed Development Framework would ensure that phasing of development will take account of existing constraints, such as road and sewerage improvements. These infrastructure upgrades will be developed in line with the requirements of the site as a whole, and not restricted by delivery of piecemeal developments.</p> <p>More importantly the development framework will build on the design principles and Concept Statement for the site which sets out the proposed mix of uses. The Development Framework approach will maximise the opportunity for the integration of the site with the town centre and could form part of a wider Strategic Regeneration Framework covering both the site and the town centre.</p> <p>1465</p> <p>A number of specific representations have been made in relation to NSA 8 which are addressed in detail below.</p> <p>A representation (Ref: 3311) has been made that the designation of the NSA 8 as a strategic site places significant reliance on one site to deliver necessary housing and employment land targets for Hirwaun. This assumes that there are issues regarding deliverability of the site within the plan period. Tower Colliery as the major landowner of the NSA 8 site has plans to extract the remaining coal on the site and undertake reclamation works in order to release the site for development within the plan period. Further objection is made to NSA 8 in that it does not have a distinguishable or defensible southern boundary. The extension of NSA 8, as per AS (N) 64, would provide a more logical and defensible relationship with the extent of the Tower Colliery site and would provide the opportunity to incorporate structural landscaping and external treatment to ensure that the subsequent development has a defined and distinctive development envelope. Comprehensive development as part of an extended site, will generate opportunities to provide restoration of the whole of the site, present opportunities for ecological mitigation and enhancement, improvements to public rights of way and access to open space.</p> <p>A representation by Nuon Renewables (Ref: 3236) objects to NSA 8 on the basis that it has the potential to</p>															



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l	SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
																<p>conflict with and sterilise land for large windfarm developments envisaged in Strategic Search Area (SSA) F by TAN8. Having reviewed the extent of SSA F as shown on Map 7 of TAN8 it clearly shows that NSA 8 and AS (N) 64 are outside of the Strategic Search Area (SSA). Therefore, we do not consider that the allocation of land as a strategic site has any impact on SSA F and consequently does not sterilise land for future wind farm development or conflict with LDP policy AW 13.</p> <p>A representation (Ref: 3396) has been made that seeks to extend the boundary of NSA 8 to include the Hirwaun Industrial Estate and redevelop that site as a mixed use development. Whilst the proposed land uses are sympathetic to the proposed allocations on NSA 8 there is no physical connectivity between the two sites, being separated by the strategic road network and it does not make sense in spatial planning terms to consider these two sites together.</p> <p>A further representation is made (Ref: 3260) which seeks to extend the boundary to the east to include candidate sites 334/335. The sites were rejected as potential development sites by the Council as part of their assessment of candidate sites as they were deemed to be in the countryside and unrelated to an existing settlement and will not contribute towards the overall objectives and strategy of the LDP.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	
		<p>Inclusion of the proposed amendments to the site identified in AS (N) 64 would improve the ability of the Council to implement the policies and principles behind the successful delivery of sustainable growth. This is to be achieved through the development of the strategic sites as supported by policy CS 3. Change to the development and settlement boundary would remove an unnecessary constraint to the comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The extension of NSA 8 to reflect the AS (N) 64 boundary will increase flexibility to enable the Council to deal with changing circumstances.</p>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>1465.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1177/ASD013 NSA 8 - Land South of Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?										Yes		
<p>Tower Colliery objects to the deletion of NSA 8 and indeed supports its inclusion as a strategic development site in order to deliver the required levels of new housing and employment opportunities to support the regeneration of Hirwaun within the plan period. We feel the need for the development is supported by a sound evidence base presented by the Council, which underpins the policy. The case for the inclusion and indeed extension of the site was made in full in our representation AS (N) 64. Policy NSA 8 supports the redevelopment of Land to the South of Hirwaun and defines within a Concept Statement a mix and quantum of development that is deemed appropriate on the site and which delivers the strategic planning objectives of the Local Development Plan and the enhancement of Hirwaun as a key settlement.</p> <p>The inclusion of NSA 8 as a strategic site is supported most notably by the WAG in their representation (REF: 3477) stating that the site could represent a significant redevelopment opportunity within the Heads of the Valleys. It lies at a strategic location and is one of the largest potential areas of brownfield strategic land to be open up by the A465(T) Heads of the Valleys [Road] dualling.</p> <p>Reponses to individual representations requesting the deletion of the land allocated in Policy NSA 8 from the LDP are summarised and the issues therein discussed below.</p> <p>Although the representation from Scarford (Hirwaun) Ltd (Ref:3308) supports the provision of improved retail, community and health facilities in Hirwaun in line with the predicted growth, they consider the delivery of development on site NSA8 does not to meet the needs of Hirwaun in the required timescale and plan period. Tower Colliery as the major landowner of the NSA 8 site has plans to extract the remaining coal on the site and undertake reclamation works in order to release the site for development within the plan period. The representation from Hirwaun &amp; Penderyn Community Council (Ref: 467) raises a number of objections to the potential for open cast mining on the site and seeks to promote the allocation of a neighbouring site (The Hirwaun/ Rhigos Industrial Estate) for employment purposes. This is not the purpose of policy NSA 8, which seeks to promote comprehensive development of the site and the regeneration of Hirwaun. The representation raises a number of other issues in terms of the suitability of the site for housing and associated retail and community uses. The development of NSA 8 provides an opportunity to deliver much needed new housing and employment uses that will support the existing community of Hirwaun and can be developed in a manner which generates connectivity with the existing settlement.</p> <p>The Environment Agency Wales (Ref: 3478) are opposing the inclusion of NSA 8 as they consider that the proposals "...could result in widespread water pollution problems". They feel that the sewerage system capacity in this area is not adequate to accommodate this level of development without significant improvements. Reclamation and enabling works will allow the development to come forward whilst mitigating the impact on water quality. This obviously will need to be assessed in more detail as part of the masterplanning and design process. Comprehensive redevelopment of the site will have impacts on 1465 existing infrastructure and improvements may need to be secured to the water and sewerage system to enable the development to come forward. This will need to form part of the detailed design work and potentially secured through developer contributions when the form of development coming forward on the site is more defined. We consider that if development of the site was progressed through a design framework, in line with our previous representation, issues such as infrastructure improvements are achievable and can be more easily delivered at the detailed planning stage.</p>														
-----														
Item Question														
Reply														
Soundness Tests														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
2	5			Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>Deletion of Policy NSA 8 from the LDP would significantly reduce the ability of the LDP to achieve its housing and employment land targets as founded by a sound evidence base. The deletion of NSA 8 would undermine the ability of the Council to deliver sustainable growth under policy CS 3. We consider that the strategy, policies and allocations are realistic and appropriate having considered the relevant alternatives and are founded on a credible evidence base.</p>														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>1465.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 851/ASN066 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1	3 - 4			Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?										
<p>A number of identical representations have been submitted to promote AS (N) 66, which covers most of the NSA 8 site, for tourism uses and as a green wedge/open space. Tower Colliery objects to the inclusion of this site for tourism and open space uses only and is promoting its inclusion as a strategic development site. NSA 8 is an important strategic site in order to deliver required levels of new housing and employment opportunities in support of the regeneration of Hirwaun within the plan period. We feel the need for the development is supported by a sound evidence base presented by the Council, which underpins the policy. The inclusion of NSA 8 as a strategic site is supported most notably by the Welsh Assembly Government in their representation (REF: 3477) stating that the site could represent a significant redevelopment opportunity within the Heads of the Valleys. It lies at a strategic location and is one of the largest potential areas of brownfield strategic land to be open up by the A465(T) Heads of the Valleys [Road] dualling. The proposed alternative land uses on land south of Hirwaun does not realise the regeneration potential of the site to support the Council's objective to deliver the sustainable growth of Hirwaun. The potential for the Council to meet their housing and employment land targets can be delivered on this site through a high quality mixed use scheme. The provision of accessible, good quality open space and green infrastructure can be achieved within the development and needs to be considered as part of the detailed design framework alongside other land uses. The proposed extension of the site as per representation AS (N) 64 would generate greater potential to deliver open space and inclusion of structural landscaping as part of the comprehensive development of the site. The Council considered the need for further Green Wedge designation as part of the evidence base underpinning the LDP. The evidence presented in the Green Wedges Topic Paper, April 2008 does not support the need for designation of a Green Wedge in the vicinity of the NSA 8 site and this is considered sound.</p> <p>The allocation of the Tower Colliery Pit Head site, as per representation AS (N) 71 for tourism and leisure uses presents a unique opportunity to promote tourism in Hirwaun which respects and builds on the area's heritage and strong links to the mining industry. The development of the Tower Colliery Pit Head Site for tourism and leisure would help to expand the tourism product offer in the area and help to create a more diverse tourism experience, which in terms meets the stated strategic policy objectives in CS 1. As such we feel that the allocation of the Tower Colliery Pit Head site for tourism is more appropriate than on a strategic employment site.</p> <p>The inclusion of NSA 8 as a strategic site, as proposed by Tower Colliery Ltd (AS (N) 64), presents a significant opportunity to deliver large scale brown field redevelopment in line with Policy CS 3. Should the allocation of site AS (N) 66, which forms a large part of NSA 8, be restricted to Tourism and Open Space uses the opportunity to deliver regeneration of the area and meet identified needs for new housing and jobs will be lost.</p> <p>1465</p> <p>Concerns have also been expressed about the phasing and delivery of infrastructure to support the development on the strategic site. The proposed Development Framework approach would ensure that phasing of development can take account of existing or future infrastructure constraints, such as road and sewerage improvements. These infrastructure upgrades will be fully integrated into the design process so that appropriate levels of provision are phased throughout the development programme and are delivered against appropriate triggers.</p>														
<i>Item Question</i>								<i>Reply</i>				<b>Soundness Tests</b>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?												
Should the development of this site be restricted to Tourism and Open Space the ability of the LDP to achieve its housing and employment land targets, as founded by a sound evidence base, would be significantly reduced. The allocation of a large part of NSA 8 for alternative uses would undermine the ability of the Council to deliver sustainable growth under policy CS 3.														
The use of NSA 8 for tourism and open space use is neither realistic nor appropriate, considering the alternative strategic mixed use alternative that is being promoted through policy NSA 8 and AS (N) 64, which is supported through a robust and credible evidence base.														

<b>1465.A4</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	S	M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Document:	Site: 1041/ASS044 Land at Hirwaun							PEX Session:							
Policy:	Map:			Issue:											
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
Tower Colliery supports the extension of the Residential Settlement Boundary to complement the extended strategic site boundary for NSA 8 which forms part of our initial representation (AS(N)64). The Residential Settlement Boundary needs to be realigned constitutes an unnecessary constraint on the comprehensive and sensitive development of the site.		
With reference to our previous representation to promote a large scale mixed use development on the site identified in Policy NSA 8, we believe that given the large-scale nature of the site a more flexible, co-orindated and comprehensive approach to its future development is required. This will allow for a more comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of the site given the long timeframe and infrastructure improvement works required. This approach underlines our clients' desire for the restoration of the whole of the which not only maximises its development potential but will also allow for greater opportunities to enhance public rights of way, culturak and ecological features through a design led regeneration process.		
Our previous representation considered that the boundary of the strategic site NSA 8, to the south of Hirwaun, should be extended to reflect the potential opportunity for the redevelopment of the site as a whole. The amendment to the settlement boundary in line with these proposals will promote successful implementation of the design framework which seeks to deliver a number of the Council's land allocation targets through comprehensive regenerationof this former industrial site.		
The proposed changes in Tower Colliery's representation AS(N) 64 to the Reasoned Justification supporting revised Policy NSA 8 will require consideration of landscape setting and potentially strctural landscaping. This should serve to protect the landscape setting of the site, whilst not precluding development on the particular areas of the site due to unnecessary constraints imposed by the current Residential Settlement Boundary.		
Tower Colliery supports the inclusion of AS(S)44 in preference to AS(S)47 in that it reflects the extended boundary of strategic site NSA 8. However, should the site boundary not be changed as per our representation AS(N) 64 then we would seek for the residential settlement boundary to be amended to reflect the current NSA 8 site boundary as shown in AS(S) 47 to remove unnecessary development constraints on the site.		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	
Inclusion of these proposed amendments to the Hirwaun settlement boundary would significantly contribute to the ability of the Council to implement the policies and principles behind the successful delivery of sustainable growth. This is to be achieved through the development of the strategic sites as supported by Policy CS 3. Change to the settlement boundary would remove an unnecessary constraint to the comprehensive redevelopment of the site.			
The current Residential Settlement Boundary is not reasonably flexible enough to enable the Council to deal with changing circumstances.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1504.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1176/ASD012 NSA 9.10 - Land to the end of Godreaman Street, Godreaman						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Yes

I support the inclusion of this site in the Development Plan as endorsed by the Authority under Policy NSA 9.10.

Development for housing satisfies the Assessment Matrix and other criteria as put forward in the supporting letter date 12 July 2009 particularly a number of options are available to access the site.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Inclusion of the site AS(D) 12 as part of the emerging Local development Plan meets the procedural/consistency and coherency/effectiveness test.

Development of the site would be anchored to the existing community and would be sustainable with regard to the town centre all environmental/biodiversity/community issues would be satisfied and would be in accordance with both central and local government vision.

<b>1535.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1101/ASS029 Ffrwd Philip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 5103 - - ffrwd Philip Farm, Efail Isaf.

<b>1556.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 892/ASN121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 1013/ASN003	Former Phurnacite Plant					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object to the proposed development because it is in a floodplain  
 We object to the proposed development because it will detract from the Cynon Valley River Park, and will not be compatible with the aims of the park.  
 We are aware that otters, a European protected species are present in this area.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.

<b>1632.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 1014/ASN004	Former Phurnacite Plant					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object to the proposed development because it is in a floodplain  
 We object to the proposed development because it will detract from the Cynon Valley River Park, and not be compatible with the aims of the park.  
 We are aware that otters, a European protected species are present in this area.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider the procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 859/ASN005						Site B opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Further we believe this represents a significant encroachment into the open country side.  Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.  Part of the site includes a SINC.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 936/ASN006 Land adjacent to Sewage treatment Works								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). WE do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA24. Further we believe this represents a significant encroachment into the open country side.  Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.  Part of the site includes a SINC.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not been the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 917/ASN007 Land opposite Ty Trevithick								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site may contain UK Priority BAP habitat.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance of Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 966/ASN008 Land adjacent to Sewage treatment Works								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA24. Further we believe this represents a significant encroachment into the open country side.  Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.  Part of the site includes a SINC.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 861/ASN009 Site A opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Further we believe this represents a significant encroachment into the open country side.  Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.  Part of the site includes a SINC.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 891/ASN010 Land at Coleg Morgannwg										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to the allocation of this land given our previous support of NSA 24 (green wedges)  This site also may contain habitats of local importance and without suggest the site merits further assessment.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 953/ASN011 Cwm Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to the allocation of this land given our previous support of NSA 24 (green wedges)  This site also may contain habitats of local importance and we would suggest the site merits further assessment.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)		

<b>1632.A10</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Document:		Site: 988/ASN014 Land at Cwmbach Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this allocation given our previous comments of support in relation to NSA 24 (green wedges)  The site is also part of a SINC.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 930/ASN017 Allotment Gardens at Windsor Terrace										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to the allocation of this land given our previous support of NSA 24 (green wedges)	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)		

<b>1632.A12</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 843/ASN018 Land at Gwaun Miskin										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this significant proposed extension into open countryside and raise objections to the allocation of this land given our previous support of policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not consider this allocation to be compatible with NSA24.  In addition CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species may be found in this area.  Our records suggest the site may have significant UKBAP priority habitats. And we also note that the site is a SINC.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A13</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 955/ASN019 Land adjacent to High Mead								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This represents an encroachment into open countryside.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A14</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 887/ASN020 Land south of Brynteg Lane								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to this change in the settlement boundary as the site is part of a SINC and has the potential to support dormice, a European Protected Species.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>1632.A15</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026						Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to the further expansion of this already large allocation, given the potential Biodiversity and landscape impacts that will arise as a consequence of the further encroachment of development up the valley sides. This is an area of significant landscape value, both visually and also through its inclusion in the Rhondda Landscape of Special Historic interest.  Much of the surrounding area may also be of significant biodiversity value through its recognition as a SINC and the presence of a number of locally and nationally important geological features in the area also gives rise to concerns.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.  We also question the requirement for an allocation of this size and consider test CE2 may also be relevant in relation to this proposal.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A16</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 852/ASN028						Golf Course Site, Brynna Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site is adjacent to the Brynna a Wern Tarw Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). And CCW are aware of records indicating that this site may contain habitat that supports Dormice, a European Protected Species.  SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration. Part of the site is also a SINC.  This allocation may also lead to coalescence of Brynna and Brynnau Gwynion.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW area 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1632.A17			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 862/ASN029						Land South of Brynna Road			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW has concerns relating to the proximity of the proposed site to the Brynna a Wern Tarw Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area. Part of the sit is also a SINC.  This allocation may also lead to coalescence of Brynna and Brynnau Gwynion.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A18</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 903/ASN030 Brynna West						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Our records suggest the site may have significant UKBAP priority habitats.  The site is also outside the current settlement boundary and is adjacent to the Brynna a Wern Tarw Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).  CCW are aware of records indicating that this site may contain habitat that supports Dormice a European Protected Species.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away.  Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A19</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 997/ASN031 Llwynau Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW object to this significant proposed extension into open countryside given previous comments and support for policies SSA 22 (green wedges) and SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with either SSA 22 or SSA 23.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

<b>1632.A20</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 946/ASN032 North of Talygarn House						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas).  
 Further it represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.  
 CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A21</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 985/ASN034 Land r/o Cilfynydd Road/ Bodwenarth								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site is part of a SINC

CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Consistency test C2.

<b>1632.A22</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 853/ASN038 Plot 10-12 Incline Row								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
CCW objects to this proposal as its outside of the settlement boundary.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A23</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 933/ASN039 Land at Cefnpennar Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object as the site is part of SINC	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A24</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 933/ASN039 Land at Cefnpennar Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25. The site may contain UK priority BAP habitats.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A25</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:	Site: 846/ASN040 Land at Crichton Farm										PEX Session:			
Policy:	Map:					Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary, given its previous comments and support for policy NSA 24 (green wedges). Much of the site is recognised as a SINC and may contain UK and Local BAP habitats.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16) Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A26</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:	Site: 990/ASN042 Land at Dare Road										PEX Session:			
Policy:	Map:					Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to the proposed development as the site is within a SINC. It also supports UK and local Biodiversity Acton plan habitats.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A27</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 944/ASN044						Land adjoining Bedw Farm Estate				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given previous comments and support for policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas) and the proposed site's encroachment into open countryside. We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with NSA 24.  The site may contain significant areas of UK priority BAP habitats, and forms part of a Site of Interest to Nature Conservation (SINC).	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

<b>1632.A28</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 965/ASN046						Land rear of Wynham Street/Kimberley Way				PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This land contains a significant area if UKBAP priority habitat and is a SINC.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A29</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 915/ASN047 Land to the rear of 119-130 High Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW object to this proposal given previous comments and support for policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with NSA 25.  
 The proposed allocation may contain areas of UK priority BAP habitat and forms part of a Site of Interest of Nature Conservation (SINC).  
 We note that this allocation lies outside the residential settlement boundary.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

<b>1632.A30</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1001/ASN048 Land at Garth Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to this major encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas).  
 In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. These large sites may also include areas of UK BAP habitat and we recommend the sites are subject to further assessment.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1632.A31			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 904/ASN049						Land south of Heol Iscoed			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:			Issue:								
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this major encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas).  In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. These large sites may also include areas of UK BAP habitat and we recommend the sites are subject to further assessment.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

1632.A32			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 970/ASN050						Land of Heol y Parc			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:			Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this major encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 22.  In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area.  Part of the site includes a SINC.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Test C2 is relevant		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A33</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 886/ASN052 Ffrwd Phillip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this significant encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 23 (Special Landscape Area).  In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. These large sites may also include areas of UK BAP habitat and we recommend the sites are subject to further assessment.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1		

<b>1632.A34</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 886/ASN052 Ffrwd Phillip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this significant encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 23 (Special Landscape Area).  In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. These large sites may also include areas of UK BAP habitat and we recommend the sites are subject to further assessment.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A35</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1057/ASS001						Former Phurnacite Plant, Abercwmboi			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to the proposed development because it is in a floodplain  We object to the proposed development because it will detract from the Cynon Valley River Park, and not be compatible with the aims of the park.  We are aware that otters, a European protected species are present in this area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assesment (SEA).  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.		

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A36</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 960/ASN053						Land adjacent to Meadow View, North			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects given previous comments and support for policy SSA 22 (green wedges). We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 22.  In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A37</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1065/ASS002 Site A opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Further CCW believes this represents a significant and unwarranted extension to the settlement boundary and encroachment into the countryside.  
 Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy.  
 Part of the site includes a SINC .

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A38</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 960/ASN053 Land adjacent to Meadow View, North										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects given previous comments and support for policy SSA 22 (green wedges). We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 22.  
 In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  
 We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A39</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 897/ASN055 Land South of the Ferns						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:			Issue:							
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  
 We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A40</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 897/ASN055 Land South of the Ferns						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:			Issue:							
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  
 We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A41</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 888/ASN057 Land East of the Ferns						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A42</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Document:		Site: 1030/ASS003 Site B opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Further CCW believes this represents a significant and unwarranted extension to the settlement boundary and encroachment into the countryside. Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy Part of the site includes SINC.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW considers that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consistency Test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16). Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A43</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 888/ASN057						Land East of the Ferns			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A44</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 967/ASN058						Land at Meadow Cottage and Ffordd Llanbad			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>1632.A45</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 952/ASN059						Land south of Grovers Field			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy SSA 22 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with SSA 22. Further we believe this represents a significant encroachment into the open country side.	
	Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object give our previous support for this policy.	
	CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	
	Part of the site includes a SINC.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
	Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)		
	Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A46</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1032/ASS004						Land adjacent to Sewage treatment Works				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Further CCW believes this represents a significant and unwarranted extension to the settlement boundary. The proposed site is isolated from other areas within current boundary.

Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy.

Part of the site includes a SINC.

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
----------------------	--------------	------------------------

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).

Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.

<b>1632.A47</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 998/ASN061						Land at 43-60 Incline Row				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to this proposal as it falls outside the established settlement boundary.

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
----------------------	--------------	------------------------

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A48</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064						Land at Hirwaun			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This represents a significant expansion of the proposed NSA 8. CCW have concerns regarding potential landscape implications for the Brecon Beacons National park as well as those more general concerns regarding NSA 8 as outlined in our response to the draft LDP dated 25 March 2009.

Part of the site is also recognised as a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)

Given the presence of the SINC and the nearby Blaen Cynon SAC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A49</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 907/ASN065						Hirwaun Ironworks, North Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW object given our previous support of policy NSA 26 Cynon Valley River Park. We do not consider that proposals for residential development of this scale are compatible with NSA 26.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A50</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1031/ASS006 Coleg Morgannwg						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
CCW object to the inclusion of this land within the settlement boundary given our previous support of NSA 24 (Green Wedges).

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  
Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).

<b>1632.A51</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1118/ASS009 Land at Cwmbach Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
CCW object o the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our previous comments and support in relation to NSA 24 (Green Wedges).  
We also note that the site is part of a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  
Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).  
Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>1632.A52</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1061/ASS013						Land adjacent to High Mead			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This represents an encroachment into open countryside.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1632.A53			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 894/ASN068 Hirwaun Industrial Estate								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Given the proximity of the proposals to the Blaen Cynon SAC, CCW advise that specific guidance should be included within the LDP relating to the need for assessment of Likely Significant Effect on the Blaen Cynon SAC and the features for which the site is of European importance. Your Authority has a duty under Regulation 3(4) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended), which requires all local planning authorities in exercise of their functions, to have regard to the provisions of the above Directive in so far that they might be affected by those functions. This would include consideration of the presence of protected species (Regulation 38-45), and an assessment of implications for European sites are required by regulation 48. Where proposals are unable to demonstrate that there will not be a likely significant effect upon the nearby Blaen Cynon SAC and the population of Marsh Fritillary butterflies which use the site, an appropriate assessment of the implications for the proposals for the site will need to be undertaken by your authority before you issue any consent or permission for the site. It is incumbent on an application to provide such information as your authority may reasonably require to undertake the appropriate assessment. Marsh fritillaries are dependent upon a network of available habitat and any losses of habitat in the area outside the SAC could be considered to have an adverse effect on the viability of the population centred on the SAC. Whilst we recognise that advice relating to this requirement is covered by other National policy we consider that it is important to at least make reference to the constraints of the site in the LDP to ensure that potential developers are aware of the importance of the site and the requirements of the regulations that have to be satisfied when dealing with this site.  CCW is also aware that this area contains a number of habitats listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan including, wet and dry heath, rhos pasture and marshy grassland habitats that may support marsh fritillary butterfly. The site is also partly designated as a SINC.  Recently the village has experienced some residential development, acting primarily as a dormitory for Cardiff, Pontypridd, Merthyr Tydfil and Aberdare. It is important therefore that any future residential development, if it is to be sustainable, should also have associated community/daily retail services/infrastructure developed in tandem with it, so that people are not forced to travel to Aberdare/ Merthyr for their daily living requirements. This applies similarly to the need for good integrated transport infrastructure for the area.  Given the prominence of the site, and within its context as a gateway to the Brecon Beacons National Park and Heads of the Valleys strategic project area, we advise that any future development should incorporate landscape and habitat improvements and enhancements and build on the strong public right of way network within the site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA_	Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.  PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning Guidance.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A54</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1107/ASS015						Land to the south of Brynteg Lane				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to this change in the settlement boundary as the site that would be included within the boundary is part of a SINC and has the potential to support dormice, a European Protected Species.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P" is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A55</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1024/ASS018						Brynna West				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Our records suggest the site may have significant UKBAP priority habitats. The site is also outside the current settlement boundary and is adjacent to the Brynna a Wern Tarw Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) CCW are aware of records indicating that this site may contain habitat that supports dormice a European Protected Species.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A56</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1113/ASS019						Land r/o Cilfynydd Road/ Bodwenarth			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site is part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC).  
CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity. Consistency test C2.

<b>1632.A57</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1050/ASS020						Plots 10-12 Incline Row			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
CCW does believe that this a warranted addition to the residential settlement boundary.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A58</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1063/ASS021 Land at Cefnpennar Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
We object to this change in the settlement boundary as the site that would be included within the boundary is part of a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subjected to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

<b>1632.A59</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1100/ASS022 Crichton Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given previous comments and support for policy NSA 24 (green wedges).  
Much of the site is recognised as a SINC and may contain UK and Local BAP habitats.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW considers that procedural test P" is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
Consistency Test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).  
Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A60</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1121/ASS025						Land rear of 119 - 130 High Street				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to the inclusion of this site in the settlement boundary given our previous comments and support for Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with NSA 25.  
 The site may contain areas of UK priority BAP habitat, and forms part of a Site of Interest to Nature Conservation (SINC).

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

<b>1632.A61</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1105/ASS028						Land adjacent to Meadow View, north of Heol Dowlai				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects given previous comments and support for policy SSA 22 (green wedges). We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 22.  
 In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).  
 We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A62</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1101/ASS029 Ffrwd Philip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this significant encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 23 (Special Landscape Area).  In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. These large sites may also include areas of UK BAP habitat and we recommend the sites are subject to further assessment.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

<b>1632.A63</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1111/ASS030 Land at Garth Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this major encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas).  In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. These large sites may also include areas of UK BAP habitat and we recommend the sites are subject to further assessment.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A64</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1097/ASS031						Land south of Heol Iscoed			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	CCW objects to this major encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas).	
	In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. These large sites may also include areas of UK BAP habitat and we recommend the sites are subject to further assessment.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
	We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.		
	The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A65</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1087/ASS040						Land south of Grovers Field			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Further CCW believes this represents a significant and unwarranted extension to the settlement boundary.

Further CCW does not believe that this proposed allocation is compatible with Policy NSA 26 (Cynon Valley River Park), and we object given our previous support for this policy.

Part of the site includes a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).

Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.

<b>1632.A66</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1041/ASS044						Land at Hirwaun			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This represents a significant expansion of the proposed NSA 8. CCW have concerns regarding potential landscape implications for the Brecon Beacons National Park as well as those more general concerns regarding NSA 8 as outlined in our response to the draft LDP dated 25th March 2009

The site is also situated on a SINC

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A67</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1077/ASS046						Land rear of Bute Terrace			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to the proposals to include this site within the residential settlement boundary given our previous support of policy NSA 26 Cynon Valley River Park. We do not consider that proposals for residential development would be compatible with NSA 26.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A68</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1083/ASS048						Land at Tyn-y-Caeau			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this significant encroachment into the countryside.  In addition CCW are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A69</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1095/ASS050						Land to the north of The Patch			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	CCW object to this significant proposed extension into open countryside given previous comments and support for policy SSA 22 (green wedges) and SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with SSA 22 and SSA 23.

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	
	Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).	
	We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.	
	The proposal may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.	



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A70</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1099/ASS054						Land at Maes y Dderwen, Aberffrwd				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to this proposal given out support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25.

CCW believes this represents a significant encroachment into an area classed as ancient or semi natural woodland. We refer your authority to 5.2.8 of Planning Policy Wales (2002) for WAG policy relating to the damage of sites classed as ancient of semi natural woodland.

The site forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC)

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.

The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1632.A71			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1081/ASS055						Land at Mwyndy			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this significant proposed extension of residential development into the currently open countryside. We are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. This large site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment.  This proposal may have significant implications for the landscape and natural heritage resources of the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A72</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1045/ASS059						Land at House o'The Trees'			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this site being included within the settlement boundary as it represents a significant encroachment into the countryside. We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 24 (green wedges).  CCW further raise objections based on the close proximity of the proposed site to the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national olicy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration.  CCW is also aware that European protected species may occur in this area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A73</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1027/ASS067						Land at Garth Isaf Farm			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with SSA 23. Further it represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal maynot meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  The proposal may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A74</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1073/ASS074						Land off Mill Street			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25. Further we believe that this is a departure and unwarranted addition to the current settlement boundary and represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.	
	We have further concerns relating to the potential impact a development at this location may have on the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration. CCW is currently contending with management issues relating to recreation pressure on areas of the SSSI in close proximity to the proposed allocation. Such an allocation would likely exacerbate existing problems.	
	CCW are aware the European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	CCW consider that procedural test P" is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).		
	We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.		
	Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW PARA 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		
	The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A75</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1054/ASS075						Land at Glyndale / Rhiwinder Fach, Pant y Brad				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to policy NSA 24 (greenwedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Further we believe that this is a departure and unwarranted addition to the current settlement boundary and represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.  We have further concerns relating to the potential impact a developmetrn at this location may have on the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSI are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration. CCW is currently contending with management issues relating to recreation pressure on areas of the SSSI in close proximity to the proposed allocation. Such an allocation would likely exacerbate existing problems.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.  The site contains UK priority BAP habitats and forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC).	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>1632.A76</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1094/ASS076						Land at Parc Eirin			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to the proposal given our previous support of policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25.  The site also forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A77</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1069/ASS079						Land rear of 53 The Avenue			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25.  We have further concerns relating to the potential impact a developemtn at this location may have on the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration. CCW is currently contending with management issues relating to recreation pressure on areas of the SSSI in close proximity to the proposed allocation. Such an allocation would likely exacerbate existing problems.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by developmetn within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upno the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning Guidance.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A78</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1115/ASS080						Land to the rear of 8 - 54 Llantrisant Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We have concerns relating to the potential impact a development at this location may have on the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration. CCW is currently contending with management issues relating to recreation pressure on areas of the SSSI in close proximity to the proposed allocation. Such an allocation would likely exacerbate existing problems.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by developmetn some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		

<b>1632.A79</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Document:		Site: 1106/ASS084						Land at Tyle Garw				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW are aware of records indicating that this site contains habitat thyat supports Dormice a European Protected Species.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>1632.A80</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1034/ASS087						Land at Buarth y Capel			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this significant extension into open countryside.  In addition CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species may be found in this area.  Our records suggest the site may contain significant areas of UKBAP priority habitats, including a significant area of lowland peat habitat now very rare within Rhondda Cynon Taff and Wales as a whole. This site also lies adjacent to an area of ancient woodland and is also recognised as a SINC.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not met the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. We also consider that given your Authoritys duty under the NERC act to consider biodiversity in the exercise of your functions, we consider it would be inappropriate to allocate this important site for developemnt. Therefore, consistency test C2 would be relevant.  The proces may have an adverse impact on the local Special Lanscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A81</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1048/ASS093						Otters Brook Farm, Ivor Park				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
CCW objects to the inclusion of this site within the settlement boundary given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24. Furtehr we believe that this is a departure and unwarranted addition to the current settlement boundary and represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.	
CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16).		
We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A82</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1053/ASS096						Land at Gloucesters Ironworks Site				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
CCW support the proposals to exclude this site from the residential settlement boundary given our previous support of policy NSA 26 Cynon Valley over Park. We do not consider that proposals for residential development would be compatible with NSA 26.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A83</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1082/ASS100						Land at Parc Eirin			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We support this change in the settlement boundary as it has the effect of excluding from the settlement boundary, land which forms part of the Rhos Tonyrefail SSSI.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

We consider that if this proposed change is not made, the plan may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A84</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1123/ASS102						Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW object to the further expansion of this already large allocation given the potential biodiversity and landscape impacts that will arise as a consequence of the further encroachment of development up the valley sides in this area of significant landscape value. Both visually and also through its inclusion in the Rhondda Landscape of Special Historic Interest. Much of the surrounding area may also be of significant biodiversity value through its recognition as a SINC and the presence of a number of locally and nationally important geological features in the area also gives rise to concerns.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.

The proposal may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

We also question the requirement for an allocation of this size and consider test CE2 may also be relevant in relation to this proposal.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>1632.A85</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1196/ASD032 SSA 10.10 - Land east of Hafod Wen and north of Concorde Drive, Tonyrefail						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW support the deletion of the above site given that part of the site is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Please see our previous response to the draft deposit LDP for further information.	

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development witin or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance aay. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1632.A86			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 894/ASN068 Hirwaun Industrial Estate										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>Given the proximity of the proposals to the Blaen Cynon SAC, CCW advise that specific guidance should be included within the LDP relating to the need of Likely Significant Effect on the Blaen Cynon SAC and the features for which the site is of European Importance. Your Authority has a duty under Regulation 3(4) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &amp;c) Regulations 1994 (as amended), which requires all local planning authorities in exercise of their functions, to have regard to the provisions of the above Directive in so far that they might be affected by those functions. This would include consideration of the presence of protected species (Regulation 38-45)m and an assessment of the implications for European sites are required by regulation 48. Where proposals are unable to demonstrate that there will not be a likely significant effect upon the nearby Blaen Cynon SAC and the population of Marsh Fritillary butterflies which use the site, an appropriate assessment of implications of the proposals for the site will need to be undertaken by your authority before you issue any consent or permission for the site. It is incumbent on an applicant to provide such information as your authority may reasonably require to undertake the appropriate assessment. Marsh fritillaries are dependent upon an adverse effect on the viability of the population centred on the SAC. Whilst we recognise that advice relating to this requirement is covered by other National policy we consider that it is important to at least make reference to the constraints of the site in the LDP to ensure that potential developers are aware of the importance of the site and the requirements of the regulations that have to be satisfied when dealing with this site.</p> <p>CCW is also aware that this area contains a number of habitats listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan including, wet and dry heath, rhos pasture and marshy grassland habitats that may support marsh fritillary butterfly. The site is also partly designated as a SINC.</p> <p>Recently the village has experienced some residential development, acting primarily as a dormitory for Cardiff, Pontypridd, Merthyr Tydfil and Aberdare. It is important therefore that any future residential development, if it is to be sustainable, should also have associated community/daily retail services/ infrastructure developed tandem with it, so that people are not forced to travel to Aberdare/ Merthyr Tydfil for their daily living requirements. This applies similarly to the need for good integrated transport infrastructure for the area.</p> <p>Given the prominence of the site, and within its context as a gateway to the Brecon Beacons National Park and Heads of the Valley strategic project area, we advise that any future development should incorporate landscape and habitat improvements and enhancements and build on the strong public right of way network within the site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</p> <p>Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.</p> <p>PPW para 5.5.8. recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impact upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.</p>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A87</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 896/ASN070	Land rear of Bute Terrace					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to the proposals to allocate this site given our previous support of policy NSA 26 Cynon valley river park. We do not consider that proposals for residential development would be compatible with NSA 26.  The site is also situated on a SINC.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		

<b>1632.A88</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site:						PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A89</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 878/ASN082 Land at the cricket field						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW object to this significant proposed extension into open countryside given previous comments and support for Policy SSA 22 (green wedges). We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with SSA 22.

We are also aware that European Protected Species are present in the area and may be impacted by significant or inappropriate development.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)

We consider the proposal may not meet with the guidance of Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A90</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 902/ASN083 Land to the north of The Patch						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW object to this significant proposed extension into open countryside given previous comments and support for policy SSA 22 (green wedges) and SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with SSA 22 and SS23.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)

We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A91</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 987/ASN085						Land to the north of Llanharry				PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this significant proposed extension into open countryside and raise objections to the allocation of this land given our previous support of policy SSA 22 (green wedges) and SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not consider this allocation to be compatible with SSA 22 and SSA 23.  In addition CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species may be found in this area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

<b>1632.A92</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1006/ASN092						Ystrad Barwig Isaf				PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species, particularly great crested newt, may be found in this area.  This allocation represents a significant encroachment in to open countryside, and outside of the residential settlement boundary.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A93</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 911/ASN094 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species, particularly great crested newt, may be found in this area. This allocation represents a significant encroachment in to open countryside, and outside of the residential settlement boundary.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A94</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Document:		Site: 910/ASN095 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species, particularly great crested newt, may be found in this area. This allocation represents a significant encroachment in to open countryside, and outside of the residential settlement boundary.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A95</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1011/ASN096						Land at Bryn Pica			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to this development because the site has the potential to support Great Crested Newts, a European Protected Species. We also object on the grounds that development here is likely to result in local landscape issues.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity. Therefore consistency test C2 is relevant.		

<b>1632.A96</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 992/ASN097						Land off Hospital Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this proposal given previous comments and support for policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not consider that proposals for development would be compatible with NSA 24. The site is also recognised as a Site of Interest to Nature Conservation (SINC) and contains UK priority BAP habitats.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16) Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A97</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 901/ASN100 Hendy Quarry						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A98</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1020/ASN101 Land at Maes y Dderwen						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25.	
CCW believes this represents a significant encroachment into an area classed as ancient or semi natural woodland. We refer your authority to 5.2.8 of Planning Policy Wales (2002) for WAG policy relating to the damage of sites classed as ancient or semi natural woodland.	
The site forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC)	

---

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		
The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A99</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 865/ASN102 Mountain Ash General Hospital						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25.  CCW believes this represents a significant encroachment into an area classed as ancient or semi natural woodland. We refer your authority to 5.2.8 of Planning Policy Wales (2002) for WAG policy relating to the damage of sites classed as ancient or semi natural woodland.  The site forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC)	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A100</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 932/ASN103 Land at Mwyndy						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this significant proposed extension of development into the currently open countryside. We are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. This large site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental assessment.  The proposal may have significant implications for the landscape and natural heritage resource of the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A101</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 913/ASN104 Land at Mwyndy						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this significant proposed extension of development into the currently open countryside. We are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area. This large site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental assessment.  This proposal may have significant implications for the landscape and natural heritage resource of the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)  C2: We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A102</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 929/ASN107						Land at former allotment at Pantygraigwen Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site may contain UK priority BAP Habitats.

CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A103</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 928/ASN108						Land at former Allotment site at Pantygraigwen Roa				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site may contain UK priority BAP Habitats.

CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A104</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 842/ASN109 Land at House O "The Trees"								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to the significant proposal given our previous comments regarding policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 24.  CCW further raise objections based on the close proximity of the proposed site to the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration.  CCW is also aware that European protected species may occur in this area.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16). PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A105</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1015/ASN110 Land South of Penywaun								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this large proposal in the open countryside on the North-facing slopes of Hirwaun Common. CCW have concerns regarding the landscape implications for the Brecon Beacons National Park.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A106</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Document: Site: 973/ASN113 Ceulan Stud, Pontyclun PEX Session:  
 Policy: Map: Issue:  
 Summary:

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy SSA 23 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with SSA 23. Further it represents a significant encroachment into open countryside. CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16) We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>1632.A107</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 892/ASN121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to this significant proposed extension into open countryside. We believe that this development is contrary to Policy SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). CCW further raise objections based on the close proximity of the proposed site to Nant Gwelliwion Woodland Site of Special Scientific Interest. In additional CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species may be found in this area. Our records suggest the site may contain areas of UK BAP priority habitats.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity. Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance. The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A108</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 931/ASN125 Werfa Farm										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Our records suggest the site may have significant UKBAP priority habitats. The site is also outside the current settlement boundary and in close proximity to the BBNP.  
 The site is partly situated in a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A109</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 858/ASN126 Land at Halt Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Our records suggest the site may have significant UKBAP priority habitats. The site is also outside the current settlement boundary and in close proximity to the BBNP.  
 The site is partly situated on a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A110</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 847/ASN129 Land at Ysgubor-wen Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
We object to the proposed development as the site is part of a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

<b>1632.A111</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 905/ASN133 Land at Garth Isaf Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with SSA 23. Further it represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.  
CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  
The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A112</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 857/ASN134 Garth Isaf Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal give our support and comments relating to Policy SSA 23 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with SSA 23. Further it represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

<b>1632.A113</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Document:		Site: 986/ASN141 Land South of Gilfach Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW object to the inclusion of part of the Rhos Tonyrefail SSSI within the proposed boundary of this allocation.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning Guidance.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A114</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 972/ASN142						SSA 10.10 - Land east of Hafod Wen and north of Co				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to this significant proposal given our previous comments regarding policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 24.

CCW further raise objections on the close proximity of the proposed site to the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration.

CCW is also aware that European protected species may occur in this area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A115</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 972/ASN142						SSA 10.10 - Land east of Hafod Wen and north of Co				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to this significant proposal given our previous comments regarding policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 24.

CCW further raise objections based on the close proximity of the proposed site to the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSI's are site where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration.

CCW is also aware that European protected species may occur in this area.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

<b>1632.A116</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 934/ASN144						SSA 10.2 - Trane Farm				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to this proposal as it represents a further extension to large strategic site. Increasing such a site would result in significant encroachment in to the countryside. Further we believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 24 (green wedges).

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Consistency test C2 is also relevant as the proposal fails to meet National Planning Policy requirements with regard to Green Wedges and associated development. (PPW section 2.6.10 - 2.6.16)

We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1632.A117			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 991/ASN145 Land at Trane Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	CCW objects to this proposal as it represents a further extension to large strategic site and has the potential to have adverse effects on the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration.	
	We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 24 (green wedges)	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the site has not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
	PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1632.A118			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 969/ASN147 Land off Mill Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 24.	
	We have further concerns relating to the potential impact a development at this location may have on the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection and deterioration. CCW is currently contending with management issues relating to recreation pressure on areas of the SSSI in close proximity to the proposed allocation. Such an allocation would likely exacerbate existing problems.	
	CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)		
	Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		
	Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		
	The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A119</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 963/ASN148 Land at Glyndale / Rhiwinder Fach, Pant y Brad										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We do not believe that this allocation is compatible with NSA 25. Further it represents a significant encroachment into open countryside.  We have further concerns relating to the potential impact a development at this location may have on the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSI are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage to deterioration. CCW is currently contending with management issues relating to recreation pressure on areas of the SSSI in close proximity to the proposed allocation. Such an allocation would likely exacerbate existing problems.  CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.  The site contains priority UK BAP habitats and forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC).	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1632.A120			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 945/ASN151						Land fronting Trebanog Road (Rhiw Garn Fawr)				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas).  In additional we are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.  This land contains priority UK BAP habitats and forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC).	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A121</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 874/ASN152 Land south of Trebanog (Rhiw Garn Fawr)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	CCW objects to this proposal as it comprises nearly wholly a section land designated under the Rhos Tonyrefail Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). SSSIs are sites where the nature conservation interest is a matter of national policy and legislation requiring protection from damage and deterioration, with its important features conserved by appropriate management. Given this, CCW strongly believes that any allocation within the forth coming LDP that contains land designated as SSSI would be inappropriate.	
	CCW also objects to this significant proposal given our support and comments relating to Policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We believe this allocation is compatible with NSA 25.	
	CCW are aware that European Protected Species may also be found in the area.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).		
	Consistency test C2 is also relevant as PPW para 5.5.8 recognises that SSSI can be damaged by development within or adjacent to their boundaries, and in some cases by development some distance away. Given the proximity of the proposals to the SSSI we consider the allocation could have adverse impacts upon the SSSI and is therefore contrary to National Planning guidance.		
	We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.		
	The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A122</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 938/ASN153 Land adjacent to Rhiw Garn (Rhiw Garn Fawr)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to this significant encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments regarding policy NSA 24 (green wedges). We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 24.  
 In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area.  
 The site may contain significant areas of UK priority BAP habitats, particularly dry heath acid grassland mosaic. The site forms part of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC).

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural Test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

<b>1632.A123</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 947/ASN154 Land rear of Trebanog Road (Rhiw Garn Fawr)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to this proposal given our previous comments regarding policy NSA 25 (Special Landscape Areas). We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 25.  
 This land contains a significant area of UKBAP priority habitat and is a Site of Interest to Nature Conservation (SINC).

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN 5 relating to Biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1632.A124</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 981/ASN155 Land north of Rhiw Garn Fawr						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW objects to this major encroachment into the countryside given our previous comments. We believe this allocation is not compatible with NSA 25 (Special Landscape areas).  
 In addition we are aware that a number of European protected species are present in this area.  
 This land contains a significant area of UKBAP priority habitat and is a Site of Interest to Nature Conservation (SINC).

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.  
 The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

<b>1632.A125</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 895/ASN173 Land at Tyle Garw						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 CCW are aware of records indicating that this site contains habitat that supports Dormice, a European Protected Species.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  
 We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1632.A126</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Document:		Site: 937/ASN174 Site off Heol Llechau						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We are concerned about landscape issues in view of the prominence of this site, within the Rhondda Landscape of Special Historic Interest. We also refer you to your Authority's LANDMAP study.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

<b>1632.A127</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
------------------	--	--	--------------------------	---	---	---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

Document:		Site: 939/ASN178 Land at Buarth y Capel						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

CCW objects to this significant extension into open countryside.

In addition CCW are aware of records indicating that European Protected Species may be found in this area.

Our records suggest the site may contain significant areas of UKBAP priority habitats, including a significant area of lowland peat habitat - a habitat now very rare within Rhondda Cynon Taff and Wales as a whole. This site also lies adjacent to an area of ancient woodland and is also recognised as a SINC.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity. We also consider that given your Authority's duty under the NERC act to consider biodiversity in the exercise of your functions, we consider it would be inappropriate to allocate this important site for development. Therefore, consistency test C2 would be relevant.

The proposals may have an adverse impact on the local Special Landscape Area and we therefore believe that this allocation is inconsistent with Test C1.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1632.A128</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 909/ASN179 Land off Ystrad Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? CCW objects to this significant encroachment into the open countryside.  The site may contain UK priority BAP habitats, and is a Site of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC).	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).  Given the presence of the SINC we consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.		

<b>1632.A129</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 979/ASN180 Garth Isaf								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site represents a significant area of biodiversity importance within Rhondda Cynon Taf and may be considered to be of National Importance given the presence of rare wetland vegetation communities.  CCW has previously objected to development proposals on this site and it is our opinion that the site should not be developed and we therefore wish to object to the allocation of this site. The site is also recognised as a SINC.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CCW consider that procedural test P2 is relevant as the sites have not been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)  We consider the proposal may not meet the guidance in Draft TAN5 relating to Biodiversity.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1643.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 886/ASN052 Ffrwd Phillip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:			Issue:										
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Additional information / Sustainability Appraisals / Habitat Assessment Scoping Report.

<b>1643.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1101/ASS029 Ffrwd Philip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:			Issue:										
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 5103 - Mr and Mrs Williams - ffrwd Philip Farm, Efail Isaf.

<b>1652.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1177/ASD013 NSA 8 - Land South of Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:			Issue:										
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Development of this site should be carefully scrutinized to ensure community cohesiveness with existing settlement; consideration to future dualling of Aa465 and provision of infrastructure to support development prior to implementation.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>1652.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1041/ASS044 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Object to including in residential settlement boundary as location of site would not provide community cohesion with either Hirwaun or Rhigos. Does not fit with plans to dual the A465.

<b>1652.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1090/ASS047 Land South of Hirwaun						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Object to inclusion in residential settlement boundary as location of site would not provide community cohesion with either Hirwaun or Rhigos. Does not fir with plans to dual the A465.

<b>1663.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
I fully support the proposal for community use and employment on this site.  
There is little chance of attracting meaningful employment to this UNLESS it is Tourism related as per Fernhill.  
BUT there is a desperate need for property integrated LOCAL healthcare in this community, this site is ideally placed for this and youth facilities and policing can be integrated too.  
This will naturally include employment too.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
The proposals are fully in accord with all tests below as stated in the submission documents.  
In addition the proposed layout of the site preserves the Zone C2 floodplain which is crucial to the SAFETY of residents in the area threatened with 1 in 40 flood risk and consequent hikes in insurance.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1663.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The inclusion of the proposed site and the associated scheme which builds upon the present Tourism and Leisure Category with the introduction of a Country Park project ticks all the sustainability boxes.  This scheme will create many new good jobs in this very deprived area. It will improve the environment by removing an eyesore and will recover the valley profile, introduce new lakes to encourage flora and fauna. It will provide a healthy place for leisure pursuits and bring wealth to the area by encouraging Tourism.  It should also trigger the entrepreneurial spirit in the community to provide associated new businesses, and therefore even more wealth and prosperity for the valley.		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It encompasses all the Tests of Soundness and ticks all the boxes. It is the only proposal that can do this.		

<b>1663.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Housing is inappropriate to this wonderful area, it is the most spectacular valley in South Wales. Increasing this site is even more a nail in the coffin.		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? excluding this site would satisfy more of the tests of soundness. Adoption of AS(N)23 instead would tick all. AS (N) 26 cannot comply with the soundness tests C1-C4, P1 or P2 or CE1 or CE2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1663.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document: Site: 880/ASN027 Former Stelco Hardy Site PEX Session:														
Policy: Map: Issue:														
Summary:														
<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? As part of AS(N)23 we support retention of the site for employment but remain aware of the restrictions of TAN15 flooding issues on this Zone C2 Floodplain.														
<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? There is too much housing and no facilities, services or jobs being proposed in this area. This proposal goes some way to addressing this.														

<b>1663.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M		Yes	159	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Document: Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site PEX Session:														
Policy: Map: Issue:														
Summary:														
<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was previously allocated for Employment. The local Health Centre is oversubscribed to an extent that a Patients participation group has been set up to help alleviate the problems being experienced by the villages. The site being central to the three villages of Blaencwm, Blaenrhondda and Tynewydd is the ideal position to locate a health centre incorporating dentist, optician and various clinics. A community facility could also be catered for within the building and the Blue building remaining on site a much needed youth centre. The scheme with its conceptual drawings was submitted with the representation along with a sustainability appraisal. Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.														
<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan. It addresses the oversight of the LDP in that it provides for the community expansion, which will be necessary as a result of the excessive house building plans for the area. If the site is lost there is nowhere else this type of amenity can be located. The scheme would provide much needed employment and cater for the youth of the area by giving them their own space within the community. The food risk to the site has been minimised by the design, the buildings are on the higher ground and using the flood plain for car parking and recreational purposes. This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1663.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1169/ASD005 NSA 5 - Former Fernhill Colliery Site										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site must be deleted as housing. There is no demand for housing in this area, no jobs, poor infrastructure, appalling roads, bad services and why would anyone want to come here - hours of driving to Cardiff. This is the most spectacular area of scenery in south Wales and must not be destroyed by housing. The future of this area is Tourism - help us generate it.	No

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It cannot satisfy the tests of soundness as does AS(N)23.		

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1663.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 919/ASN160 Former Stelco Hardy Factory										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site is Zone C2 Flood risk, it is not suitable for HIGHLY VULNERABLE DEVELOPMENT and NO mitigating possibilities are acceptable under TAN 15.  Furthermore Wales Spacial Plan AW1 is far over subscribed for housing in Rhondda Fawr and there are MANY empty properties in this area that have in some cases been empty for over a year. There is NO demand for Housing and indeed there are NO JOBS to support Housing.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It would make it comply with soundness tests ie P1, P2, C1, C3, C4, CE2		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1663.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M		Yes	198	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 919/ASN160 Former Stelco Hardy Factory										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	The Stelco Hardy Site sits in an oxbow of the river on land previously reclaimed from riverbed as Eileen Park. The whole site is classified as C2 not suitable for vulnerable development so its suggested RESIDENTIAL CATEGORY is totally unsuitable. There is already within the LDP an over allocation of housing within the Treherbert Ward and no proven need for Affordable Homes.	
	The suggested alternative use for the site AS (N) 25 as Community Use providing health, youth, employment and community provision is a much needed amenity in this area. The suggested design utilising only the higher ground to the west of the site will ensure the buildings are above the flood plain and the ground to the east as car parking and recreational areas being less vulnerable and available to flood retaining its status as a C2 flood plain therefore.	
	I object to this site being included under policy NSA9 as RESIDENTIAL for 70 houses.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the CE2 coherence and effectiveness test and C3 regarding the Wales Spatial Plan		
	1. Housing in the area is already oversubscribed against the allocation in the Wales Spatial Plan. Policy AW1		
	2. It contravenes policy AW2 point 5, building on flood plains.		
	3. Policy NSA10 housing density, at 70 homes for this area of land a previous application was for 49.		
	4. No relative alternative has been assessed.		
	5. It has not be subjected to a sustainability Appraisal		
	6. The Northern Strategy Area has already met its allocation for new housing, policy NSA9		
	7. No provision has been made in the LDP for community needs due to the proposed house building, policy NSA16 reuse of Industrial Space for Employment.		
	8. The site is the last one available, on the valley floor, which is central to the villages of Blaencwm, Blaenrhondda and Tynewydd.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1663.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1123/ASS102						Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This development - to which I object is unsuitable, is north and partly east of Blaenrhondda which is a Unique Conservation Area in the Rhondda. The inclusion of this totally inappropriate proposed development within (attached to) a conservation area is entirely wrong. The entire existing village is only 333 houses and the proposed development is in excess of 800! It will totally overwhelm the area and must not be allowed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It's exclusion will put some sanity into the LDP. The following apply, it fails P1 there has been no community input, protestations have been ignored, the site grows in size all the time. P2 is FLAWED, C1 ignores the scenery and location and environment. C2 & C3 & C4 do not support the proposals, CE2 is blatantly FLAWED.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1800.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1800.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>1827.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 869/ASN012 Land at Abernant Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	1. This area of land is bounded on three sides by banks of well-established trees the subject of a long standing tree preservation order (TPO). The plan appears to indicate that part of the proposed development will intrude into the TPO area particularly on the eastern side , it is my understanding that:	
	2. This particular site was recently re-instated by developers of the river level site as a penalty imposed by the Forestry Commission for the felling of too much timber without the necessary licence. Allowing this site to be developed would in my opinion be adding insult to injury by appearing to condone the breaking of regulations.	
	3. The nearby river level sites already has planning permission for a substantial number of houses and there is therefore no need for this additional site which is immediately adjacent to the river level site.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	Exclusion of this site will act as a buffer and will protect the valuable belt of TPO trees that bound the site. It will also prevent the area from being over developed with residential development. Inclusion of this site would send the completely wrong message to developers. If rules have been broken and a penalty imposed, it would be extremely unwise of a planning authority to allow development in a re-instated area.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1827.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 951/ASN015 Land West of Abernant Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

1. This area of land is bounded on three sides by banks of well-established trees the subject of a long standing tree preservation order (TPO). The plan appears to indicate that part of the proposed development will intrude into the TPO area particularly on the eastern side , it is my understanding that:
2. This particular site was recently re-instated by developers of the river level site as a penalty imposed by the Forestry Commission for the felling of too much timber without the necessary licence. Allowing this site to be developed would in my opinion be adding insult to injury by appearing to condone the breaking of regulations.
3. The nearby river level sites already has planning permission for a substantial number of houses and there is therefore no need for this additional site which is immediately adjacent to the river level site.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Exclusion of this site will act as a buffer and will protect the valuable belt of TPO trees that bound the site. It will also prevent the area from being over developed with residential development. Inclusion of this site would send the completely wrong message to developers. If rules have been broken and a penalty imposed, it would be extremely unwise of a planning authority to allow development in a re-instated area.

<b>1827.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 988/ASN014 Land at Cwmbach Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This area forms a pleasant green wedge between Plasdraw and Cwmbach. If developed it would create undesirable ribbon development along Cwmbach Road and would also compromise the Green Wedge between Abernant and Cwmbach as identified on the Deposit Draft LDP.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1 - It will maintain the cohesiveness of the LDP by maintaining in its entirety the Green Wedge specified in the Deposit Draft LDP.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1827.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1118/ASS009						Land at Cwmbach Road			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?												
This area forms a pleasant green wedge between Plasdraw and Cwmbach. If developed it would create undesirable ribbon development along Cwmbach Road and would also compromise the Green Wedge between Abernant and Cwmbach as identified on the Deposit Draft LDP.														

<i>Item Question</i>										<i>Reply</i>					<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?													
C1 - It will maintain the cohesiveness of the LDP by maintaining in its entirety the Green Wedge specified in the Deposit Draft LDP.															

<b>1827.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 847/ASN129						Land at Ysgubor-wen Farm			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?												
This is an isolated development in open countryside and would set a dangerous precedent fir further developemtn here in open countryside and towards Llwydcoed and Trecynon. In adition it has poor access to link with existing settlement boundaries.														

<i>Item Question</i>										<i>Reply</i>					<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?													
Its inclusion would inevitably lead to further pressure on open countryside in this area.															

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1827.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1118/ASS009 Land at Cwmbach Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This area forms a pleasant green wedge between Plasdraw and Cwmbach. If developed it would create undesirable ribbon development along Cwmbach Road and would also compromise the Green Wedge between Abernant and Cwmbach as identified on the Deposit Draft LDP.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1 - It will maintain the cohesiveness of the LDP by maintaining in its entirety the green wedge specified in the Deposit Draft LDP.

**1864.A1**

O

M






Document:

Site: 904/ASN049 Land south of Heol Iscoed

PEX Session:

Policy:

Map:

Issue:

Summary:

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We fully support the LDP in this exclusion of this site with objection based on the protection of the Special Landscape Area; sustainability; protection of open space.

Protection of SLA: We are against the removal of SLA designation as we believe the all landscape approach is important, in accordance with PPW (Planning Policy Wales March 2002). The site is unspoilt form land forming a pleasing vista which can be seen from most areas of the village.

Sustainability: The proposed exclusion would result in a 40% increase in the number of houses in the village. Site not appropriate due to poor transport links, poor road access to the site. Ffrwd Philip in a single track land which is barely able to accommodate present local traffic. The drainage systems are already inadequate as evident by flooding problems along Heol y Capel and Heol y Parc. Wildlife including bats, buzzards, pheasants, red kites etc would have this habitat destroyed thus conflicting with policy AW8.

Protection of open spaces: This development would adversely affect the provision of open space LDP SSA 13.1

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

This proposed site does not support the role and function of a small settlement (AW2.6) It is not close to a sustainable transport options AW2.3 and is not within a defined settlement boundary (AW2.1)

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1864.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 886/ASN052 Ffrwd Phillip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	We fully support the LDP in this exclusion of this site with objection based on the protection of the Special Landscape Area; sustainability; protection of open space.	
	Protection of SLA: We are against the removal of SLA designation as we believe the all landscape approach is important, in accordance with PPW (Planning Policy Wales March 2002). The site is unspoilt form land forming a pleasing vista which can be seen from most areas of the village.	
	Sustainability: The proposed exclusion would result in a 40% increase in the number of houses in the village. Site not appropriate due to poor transport links, poor road access to the site. Ffrwd Philip in a single track land which is barely able to accommodate present local traffic. The drainage systems are already inadequate as evident by flooding problems along Heol y Capel and Heol y Parc. Wildlife including bats, buzzards, pheasants, red kites etc would have this habitat destroyed thus conflicting with policy AW8.	
	Protection of open spaces: This development would adversely affect the provision of open space LDP SSA 13.1	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	This proposed site does not support the role and function of a small settlement (AW2.6)It is not close to sustainable transport options AW2.3 and not within a defined settlement boundary (AW2.1)		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1864.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1101/ASS029 Ffrwd Philip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Fully supported the LDP in its exclusion of this site with objection based on the following grounds:  (i) Protection of SLA status (ii) Protection of open spaces (iii) Sustainability.  Special Landscape Area: We oppose removal of SLA designation as it is against an all-Wales and European approach which is unacceptable.  Protection of Open Spaces: This low lying farm-land should be protected by policy SSA which should be kept for grazing sheep and cattle. The public footpath is used by many local people who make use of the open space and countryside around this small vialge.  Sustainability: There are very poor transport links and the single track lane would not accommodate extra vehicles which would of necessity have to travel using this road. This would lead to further pollution and congestion.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	Inclusion of this alternative site negates the soundnes of the LDP in terms of Tests P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4 and CE2.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1864.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1097/ASS031						Land south of Heol Iscoed			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We fully support the LDP in its exclusion of this site with objections based on the following grounds: (i) Special Landscape Area (ii) Protection of Open Space (iii) Sustainability  Special Landscape Area: We oppose removal of SLA designation as it is against all-Wales and European approach which is unacceptable.  Protection of Open Spaces: This site lies at the edge of a small village and is precisely the unspoilt low lying farmland that Policy SSA 13 should and must protect. This development would adversely affect the provision of open space (LDP: SSA 13.1) and the countryside around this village.  Sustainability: This proposed further development would lead to congestion, pollution and poorer road safety in the village, narrow country lanes and the bypass. It is not a 'good site for creating employment as the infrastructure would not cope.  Doctors Surgery/Pharmacy: Not feasible unless it is as part of the local health board's estates strategy.  Identity and Culture of Community: The proposed development would destroy the culture and identity of the community which should be protected and nurtured.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Inclusion of this alternative site negates the soundness of the LDP in terms of tests P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4 and CE2.		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1865.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1865.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1867.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This site was previously allocated for Employment. The local Health Centre is oversubscribed to an extent that a Patients participation group has been set up to help alleviate the problems being experienced by the villages.

The site being central to the three villages of Blaencwm, Blaenrhondda and Tynewydd is the ideal position to locate a health centre incorporating dentist, optician and various clinics. A community facility could also be catered for within the building and the Blue building remaining on site a much needed youth centre.

The scheme with its conceptual drawings was submitted with the representation along with a sustainability appraisal.

Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan.

It addresses the oversight of the LDP in that it provides for the community expansion, which will be necessary as a result of the excessive house building plans for the area. If the site is lost there is nowhere else this type of amenity can be located. The scheme would provide much needed employment and cater for the youth of the area by giving them their own space within the community.

The food risk to the site has been minimised by the design, the buildings are on the higher ground and using the flood plain for car parking and recreational purposes.

This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.

**1893.A1**

O

M






Document:

Site: 896/ASN070 Land rear of Bute Terrace

PEX Session:

Policy:

Map:

Issue:

Summary:

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I object to the inclusion of this site for residential development and to it being included in the settlement boundary. The original site assessment methodology correctly identified that this site is an important community amenity for recreation and also a SINC site. This assessment has been given further weight because the land has now been registered as a village green by RCT Council (Decision July 20th 2009) following a public inquiry heard by an independent inspector.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1, C4, CE3

P1

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1893.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1077/ASS046 Land rear of Bute Terrace						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I object to the inclusion of this site for residential development and to it being included in the settlement boundary. The original site assessment methodology correctly identified that this site is an important community amenity for recreation and also a SINC site. This assessment has been given further weight because the land has now been registered as a village green by RCT Council (Decision July 20th 2009) following a public inquiry heard by an independent inspector.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? C1, C4, CE2  P1		

1893.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 907/ASN065 Hirwaun Ironworks, North Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I object to this site been identified for housing. The original site assessment methodology correctly identified that it is subject to access constraints and also a SINC site. The site is also a well used recreational amenity for the immediate and wider community. The site has formally registered as a village green by RCT Council (Decision July 20th 2009) following a public inquiry heard by an independent Inspector. Should development of this site not come forward through existing condion (Outline Planning permission ) subject to appeal / contest, this site should also not benefit from being included in the residential settlement boundary this concern waasexpressed at the last consultation but has not been taken forward to this stage of consultation - Why not?	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? C1, C4, CE2, P1.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1930.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1019/ASN025						Former Stelco Hardy Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:			Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	This site was previously allocated to employment. The local Health Centre is oversubscribed to an extent that a Patients participation group has been set up to help alleviate the problems being experienced by villages.	
	This site being central to three villages of Blaencwm, Blaenrhondda and Tynewydd is the ideal position to locate a health centre incorporating dentists, optician and various clinics. A community facility could also be catered for within the building and the blue building remaining on the site a much needed youth centre.	
	The scheme with its conceptual drawings was submitted with the representation along with a sustainability appraisal.	
	Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taff Community Plan.		
	It addresses the oversight of the LDP in that it provides for the community expansion, which will be necessary as a result of the excessive house building plans for the area. If the site is lost there is nowhere else this type of amenity can be located. The scheme would provide much needed employment and cater for the youth of the area by giving them their own space within the community.		
	The flood risk to the site has been minimised by the design, the buildings are on the higher ground and using the flood plain for car parking and recreational purposes.		
	This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts its basic policies.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1930.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M		Yes	163	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The submission of the alternative extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. This site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a strategic site for mixed use development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no employment allocation, has flooding issues, access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF wind factory proposal in South Wales located at the northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter and without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his costs in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for services, amenities and community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the strategic site covered by policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that: 1. It exceeds the Housing Allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For the Rhondda Fawr. 2. It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study. 3. It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5. 4. It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas. 5. It is not achievable due o the several restraints such as access and weather. 6. It would be detrimental to the only employment opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure. 7. A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1930.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M		Yes	163	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1930.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 906/ASN159 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text	
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?		
	The A4061 Rhigos Road surrounds the site on three sides, a housing estate in this position would be subjected to constant traffic noise day and night and the pollution from exhaust fumes intolerable. There is no position along this boundary where a safe access could be created. People living in the area are aware of the danger of two hairpin bends in close proximity and the difficulty exiting the garage due to the sweep of the road, which blocked the view of the cards coming down the mountain until they were nearly at the junction. There are watercourses on the site, which has already been subject to flooding. There is already an over allocation of houses in the Treherbert Ward as per the Wales Spatial Plan and no proven need for affordable homes. I therefore strongly object to AS (N) 161 Land at Rhigos road under the category of Residential and support the alternative use AS (N) 150 as Employment/Educational.		
Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	This suggested alternative use for the site would bring much needed employment to the area, be a pilot scheme for green energy and the proposed Educational facility could act as a Tourist attraction.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1930.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 919/ASN160 Former Stelco Hardy Factory								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	The Stelco Hardy Site sits in an oxbow of the river on land previously reclaimed from riverbed as Eileen Park. The whole site is classified as C2 no suitable for vulnerable development so its suggested Residential Category is totally unsuitable. There is already within the LDP an over allocation of housing within the Treherbert Ward and no proven need for Affordable Homes. The suggested alternate use for the site AS(N)25 as Community Use providing health, youth, employment and community provision is a much needed amenity in this area. The suggested design utilising only the higher ground to the west of the site will ensure the buildings are above the flood plain and the ground to the east as car parking and recreational areas being less vulnerable and available to flood retaining its status as a C2 flood plain.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the CE2 coherence and effectiveness test and C3 regarding the Wales Spatial Plan		
	1. Housing in the area is already oversubscribed against the allocation in the Wales Spatial Plan. Policy AW1		
	2. It contravenes policy AW2 point 5, building on flood plains.		
	3. Policy NSA10 housing density, at 70 homes for this area of land a previous application was for 49.		
	4. No relative alternative has been assessed.		
	5. It has not be subjected to a sustainability Appraisal		
	6. The Northern Strategy Area has already met its allocation for new housing, policy NSA9		
	7. No provision has been made in the LDP for community needs due to the proposed house building, policy NSA 16 reuse of Industrial Space for Employment.		
	8. The site is the last one available, on the valley floor, which is central to the villages of Blaencwm, Blaenrhondda and Tynewydd.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1930.A6			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 920/ASN161 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The A4061 Rhigos Road surrounds the site on three sides. A housing estate in this position would be subjected to constant traffic noise day and night and the pollution from exhaust fumes intolerable. There is no position along this boundary where a safe access could be created. People living in the area are aware of the danger of two hairpin bends in close proximity and the difficulty exiting the garage due to the sweep of the road, which blocked the view of the cars coming down the mountain until they were nearly at the junction. There are watercourses on the site, which has already been subject to flooding. There is already an over allocation of houses in the Treherbert Ward as per the Wales Spatial Plan and no proven need for affordable homes. I therefore strongly object to AS (N) 161 Land at Rhigos Road under the category of Residential and support the alternative use AS (N) 159 as Employment/Educational.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

It fails the Coherence and Effectiveness tests in that it is not realistic and appropriate.

1930.A7			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1021/ASN162 Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue, Treherbert						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This area of land is a reclaimed coal tip. It has steep sloping sides and a flat plateau. Its allocation under policy NSA9.16 for 150 houses exceeds the allocation for the whole of the Treherbert Ward. Situated in the area known as Pen Yr Englyn where numerous Council houses have already been demolished, there is no proven need for affordables. I therefore support the suggested category of Leisure for the above site and the deletion covered by AS (D) 37 of the Residential category.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

1. The site consists of reclaimed land.
3. It has topography constraints.
3. Drainage problems.

The suggested use Residential under policy NSA9.16 is not achievable, while the category Leisure would make the LDP much more robust based on the available evidence.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1930.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1016/ASN163 Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue, Treherbert								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This area of land is a reclaimed coal tip. It has steep sides and a flat plateau. Its allocation under policy NSA9.16 for 150 houses exceeds the allocation for the whole of the Treherbert Ward. Situated in the area known as Pen Yr Englyn where numerous Council Houses have already been demolished, there is no proven need for affordables. I therefore support the suggested category of Leisure and Recreation for the above site and the deletion covered by AS (D) 37 of the Residential category.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? 1. The site consists of reclaimed land. 2. It has topography constraints. 3. Drainage problems. The suggested use Residential under policy NSA9.16 is not achievable, while the category Leisure and Recreation would make the LDP much more robust based on the available evidence.		

<b>1930.A9</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 855/ASN164 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was formally Treherbert Hospital and the playing field (known as the stones field) below it. The entrance to the site is very narrow and lined by plane trees, which have a preservation order. The playing field has been used for informal recreation for years. The A4061 Rhigos Road runs along the back of the site, which is situated just above a hairpin bend. Access from the site to the main road in Treherbert would mean traffic would emerge at a cross roads and due to its location is a very difficult junction to manoeuvre. Its allocation under policy NSA9.15 for 50 houses exceeds the allocation for the Treherbert Ward and there is no proven need in the area for affordables, in fact there is a surplus of empty properties. I therefore support its inclusion as a alternate candidate site under the category Employment/Energy/Educational.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This category would provide a much needed boost to the economy in this area, contribute towards the climate change policy and by providing Educational facilities could tap into the growing Tourist market. It would make the plan more robust and achievable.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>1930.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 980/ASN166 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This site was formally Treherbert Hospital and the playing field (known locally as the stones field) below it. The entrance to the site is very narrow and lined by plane trees, which have a preservation order. The playing field has been used for informal recreation for years. The A4061 Rhigos Road runs along the back of the site, which is situated just above a hairpin bend. Access from the site to the main road in Treherbert would mean traffic would emerge at a cross roads and due to its location is a very difficult junction to manoeuvre. Its allocation under Policy NSA9.15 for 50 houses exceeds the fact that there is a surplus of empty properties.

I therefore support its inclusion as an alternate candidate site under the category Open Space, Play.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

It would provide a much needed green, public amenity space.

<b>1930.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 924/ASN170 Land at Prospect Green						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

To grant this area village green status will protect the land from future attempts to remove its public open space status and sell it for residential purposes.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

This is a long term proposal and will encourage residents to improve the area for future generations encouraging a healthy lifestyle as proposed in the Rhondda Community Plan.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>1930.A12</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1201/ASD037						NSA 9.16 - Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No
<p>This area of land is a reclaimed coal tip. It has steep sloping sides and a flat plateau. Its allocation under policy NSA9.16 for 150 houses exceeds the allocation for the whole of the Treherbert ward. Situated in the area known as Pen Yr Englyn where numerous Council Houses have already been demolished, there is no proven need for affordables. I therefore support the suggested category of Leisure for the above site and the deletion covered by AS (D) 37 of the residential category.</p>		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
<p>1. The site consists of reclaimed land.                  2. It has topography constraints.                  3. Drainage Problems.                  The suggested use Residential under policy NSA9.16 is not achieve able, while the category Leisure would make the LDP much more robust based on the available evidence.</p>			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2027.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1007/ASN130 Forgemasters Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We support the inclusion of this site in the LDP. The proposed development will:
- I) Entail the redevelopment and moe beneficial use of a brownfield site
  - II) Maximise the efficient use of a site at a key transport mode
  - III) Provide 247 additional park and ride car park spaces in accordance with Policy SSA 20.
  - IV) Provide a mix of uses that support the development of sustainable communities
  - V) Contribute to the housing requirement in Rhondda Cynon Taff.
  - VI) Improve local connectivity and improve the availability of services in Taffs Well.
  - VII) Deliver the potential for environmental, ecological, biodiversity and landscape enhancements, and
  - VIII) Create over 400 new jobs.

It is considered that the site inclusion would accord with the settlement strategy.

Paragraph 4.7 of the Deposit LDP confirms that, in the south of the County Borough proposals 'will promote sustainable development by providing a managed form of growth which will consolidate existing settlement patterns; have regard to the social and economic function and identity of settlements and the surrounding countryside; address existing or potential capacity needs to provide necessary infrastructure and reduce the need to travel'

The proposed development is within the existing urban area of Taffs Well and will accord with the principle set out in paragraph 4.7.

Paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 explain that the Principal Towns are important hubs for social and economic activity by acting as gateways for new investment, innovation and sustainable development. The position of each f the towns in respect of the strategic transport network also means that they are important.

The proposed development and Taffs Well are important to investment, sustainable development and public transport. Whilst Taffs Well is relatively low in the settlement heirarchy it has a range of services and facilities which are similar to those held by higher order settlements. It is therefore appropriate to intensify development at Taffs Well.

It is also clear that the development would complement Taffs Well and itself share some of the characteristics of locations higher in the settlement heirarchy, such as the proximity to the main road network, rail station and the proposed mix of uses. Further, it must be recognised that the site is brownfield site within the urban boundary of Taffs Well.

The redevelopment of the site is necessary in order to accommodate the additional parking that will improve Taffs Well park an ride and bring about the future beneficial use of the area. The site must therefore be allocated for mixed use redevelopment.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Soundness Tests</b>

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The redevelopment would positively address policy SSA 20 which seeks the improvement of park and ride facilities, including at Taffs Well station. This policy reflects the regional transport plan. The proposal to improve park and ride facilities would therefore improve consistency test C1, by better meeting other plans and policies.

The proposal would also enable the LDP to better meet test CE1. A significant cross boundary issue is the flow of commuters into Cardiff along the A470 corridor. A specific and positive action to increase car parking at the station will more effectively address this cross-border issue.

The proposal would enable the delivery of additional parking spaces at the proposed park and ride. The redevelopment of the site is required to deliver these spaces. Therefore, the allocation of the site for mixed use redevelopment would ensure that there are mechanisms for implementation as required by test CE3.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2027.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1005/ASN131						Forgemasters Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
- We support the inclusion of this site in the LDP. The proposed development will:
- I) Entail the redevelopment and more beneficial use of a brownfield site
  - II) Maximise the efficient use of a site at a key transport mode
  - III) Provide 247 additional park and ride car park spaces in accordance with Policy SSA 20.
  - IV) Provide a mix of uses that support the development of sustainable communities
  - V) Contribute to the housing requirement in Rhondda Cynon Taff.
  - VI) Improve local connectivity and improve the availability of services in Taffs Well.
  - VII) Deliver the potential for environmental, ecological, biodiversity and landscape enhancements, and
  - VIII) Create over 400 new jobs.

It is considered that the site inclusion would accord with the settlement strategy.

Paragraph 4.7 of the Deposit LDP confirms that, in the south of the County Borough proposals 'will promote sustainable development by providing a managed form of growth which will consolidate existing settlement patterns; have regard to the social and economic function and identity of settlements and the surrounding countryside; address existing or potential capacity needs to provide necessary infrastructure and reduce the need to travel'

The proposed development is within the existing urban area of Taffs Well and will accord with the principle set out in paragraph 4.7.

Paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 explain that the Principal Towns are important hubs for social and economic activity by acting as gateways for new investment, innovation and sustainable development. The position of each of the towns in respect of the strategic transport network also means that they are important.

The proposed development and Taffs Well are important to investment, sustainable development and public transport. Whilst Taffs Well is relatively low in the settlement hierarchy it has a range of services and facilities which are similar to those held by higher order settlements. It is therefore appropriate to intensify development at Taffs Well.

It is also clear that the development would complement Taffs Well and itself share some of the characteristics of locations higher in the settlement hierarchy, such as the proximity to the main road network, rail station and the proposed mix of uses. Further, it must be recognised that the site is brownfield site within the urban boundary of Taffs Well.

The redevelopment of the site is necessary in order to accommodate the additional parking that will improve Taffs Well park and ride and bring about the future beneficial use of the area. The site must therefore be allocated for mixed use redevelopment.



Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<i>Item Question</i>															<b>Soundness Tests</b>

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The redevelopment would positively address policy SSA 20 which seeks the improvement of park and ride facilities, including at Taffs Well station. This policy reflects the regional transport plan. The proposal to improve park and ride facilities would therefore improve consistency test C1, by better meeting other plans and policies.

The proposal would also enable the LDP to better meet test CE1. A significant cross boundary issue is the flow of commuters into Cardiff along the A470 corridor. A specific and positive action to increase car parking at the station will more effectively address this cross-border issue.

The proposal would enable the delivery of additional parking spaces at the proposed park and ride. The redevelopment of the site is required to deliver these spaces. Therefore, the allocation of the site for mixed use redevelopment would ensure that there are mechanisms for implementation as required by test CE3.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2027.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1004/ASN132 Forgemasters Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
- We support the inclusion of this site in the LDP. The proposed development will:
- I) Entail the redevelopment and more beneficial use of a brownfield site
  - II) Maximise the efficient use of a site at a key transport mode
  - III) Provide 247 additional park and ride car park spaces in accordance with Policy SSA 20.
  - IV) Provide a mix of uses that support the development of sustainable communities
  - V) Contribute to the housing requirement in Rhondda Cynon Taff.
  - VI) Improve local connectivity and improve the availability of services in Taffs Well.
  - VII) Deliver the potential for environmental, ecological, biodiversity and landscape enhancements, and
  - VIII) Create over 400 new jobs.

It is considered that the site inclusion would accord with the settlement strategy.

Paragraph 4.7 of the Deposit LDP confirms that, in the south of the County Borough proposals 'will promote sustainable development by providing a managed form of growth which will consolidate existing settlement patterns; have regard to the social and economic function and identity of settlements and the surrounding countryside; address existing or potential capacity needs to provide necessary infrastructure and reduce the need to travel'

The proposed development is within the existing urban area of Taffs Well and will accord with the principle set out in paragraph 4.7.

Paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 explain that the Principal Towns are important hubs for social and economic activity by acting as gateways for new investment, innovation and sustainable development. The position of each of the towns in respect of the strategic transport network also means that they are important.

The proposed development and Taffs Well are important to investment, sustainable development and public transport. Whilst Taffs Well is relatively low in the settlement hierarchy it has a range of services and facilities which are similar to those held by higher order settlements. It is therefore appropriate to intensify development at Taffs Well.

It is also clear that the development would complement Taffs Well and itself share some of the characteristics of locations higher in the settlement hierarchy, such as the proximity to the main road network, rail station and the proposed mix of uses. Further, it must be recognised that the site is brownfield site within the urban boundary of Taffs Well.

The redevelopment of the site is necessary in order to accommodate the additional parking that will improve Taffs Well park and ride and bring about the future beneficial use of the area. The site must therefore be allocated for mixed use redevelopment.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
Item Question										Reply		Soundness Tests		

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The redevelopment would positively address policy SSA 20 which seeks the improvement of park and ride facilities, including at Taffs Well station. This policy reflects the regional transport plan. The proposal to improve park and ride facilities would therefore improve consistency test C1, by better meeting other plans and policies.

The proposal would also enable the LDP to better meet test CE1. A significant cross boundary issue is the flow of commuters into Cardiff along the A470 corridor. A specific and positive action to increase car parking at the station will more effectively address this cross-border issue.

The proposal would enable the delivery of additional parking spaces at the proposed park and ride. The redevelopment of the site is required to deliver these spaces. Therefore, the allocation of the site for mixed use redevelopment would ensure that there are mechanisms for implementation as required by test CE3.

**2031.A1**

Document: Site: 887/ASN020 Land south of Brynateg Lane PEX Session:  
 Policy: Map: Issue:  
 Summary:

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as an objection.

**2031.A2**

Document: Site: 1107/ASS015 Land to the south of Brynateg Lane PEX Session:  
 Policy: Map: Issue:  
 Summary:

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 4796 - Wingfield Estates - Land at Brynateg, Beddau.

**2033.A1**

Document: Site: 961/ASN051 Land adjacent to the Willows and Heol Dowlais PEX Session:  
 Policy: Map: Issue:  
 Summary:

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2033.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 960/ASN053 Land adjacent to Meadow View, North						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Please see attached supporting sustainability appraisal and Habitat Assessment Scoping Report.

<b>2033.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1056/ASS026 Land adjacent to the Willows and Heol Dowlais						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 4772 (iv) - - Land adjacent to The Willows and Heol Dowlais, Efail Isaf (LPA Ref: 2033)

<b>2033.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1104/ASS027 South of Heol Dowlais						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 4772(iii) Mr RW Gay - Land South of Heol Dowlais, Efail Isaf.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2033.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:								Site: 1105/ASS028	Land adjacent to Meadow View, north of Heol Dowlai				PEX Session:	
Policy:					Map:								Issue:	
Summary:														
<hr/>														
<i>Item Question</i>														
<b>Representation Text</b>														
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 4772(v) Mr RW Gay - Land adjacent to Meadow View and North of Heol Dowlais, Efail Isaf.												
<b>2035.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:								Site: 1020/ASN101	Land at Maes y Dderwen				PEX Session:	
Policy:					Map:								Issue:	
Summary:														
<hr/>														
<i>Item Question</i>														
<b>Representation Text</b>														
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence.												
<b>2035.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:								Site: 1099/ASS054	Land at Maes y Dderwen, Aberffwd				PEX Session:	
Policy:					Map:								Issue:	
Summary:														
<hr/>														
<i>Item Question</i>														
<b>Representation Text</b>														
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 4759 - Estate of Land at Maed y Dderwen, Aberffwd, Mountain Ash.												

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>2036.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 962/ASN062						Land rear of Llwynpennau Cottages			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? SA/SEA and supporting information received	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2048.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1057/ASS001						Former Phurnacite Plant, Abercwmboi			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This representation objects to the inclusion of the site on the deletion register.  Our previous representations confirmed that CPL Industries is working with the Welsh Assembly Government on a master planning exercise for the site to deliver a scheme in broad accordance with the land uses proposed at paragraph 6.31 points (d) to (f) of the Deposit Plan. However, that allocation should be made as the main thrust of the policy rather than as an option to consider subject to satisfying other tests (which have now been satisfied). This representation is in addition to the representations made on the Deposit Plan which confirms that a Flood Consequence Assessment was being prepared in support of that master plan.  As a result of consultation with the Environment Agency and a detailed scoping exercise, specialist consulting engineers have recently completed detailed 2D river catchment hydraulic modelling. This analysis has been submitted to the Environment Agency for review and demonstrates that for both the Q100 and Q1000 events, residential development on the site is acceptable in the context of national planning policy requirements and specifically the requirements set out in TAN15.  The detailed modelling has been based on extensive on site analysis and accurate topographical survey information, therefore superseding the largely desk based flood risk assessments that were commissioned of all strategic sites and led to the removal of the housing allocation for the site.  On this basis, it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that the flood risk on site has been fully considered and should not act as a constraint to making a site specific allocation for around 500 residential units in accordance with the previous plan allocation. This contribution should then form part of the overall housing allocation.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
------	----------	-------	-----------------

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
2	5			Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The former Phurnacite Plant was previously allocated for residential development in the LDP Preferred Strategy. The allocation was removed after desk based research raised concern over flooding.</p> <p>Detailed on site analysis and 2D hydraulic modelling has confirmed that residential development would be entirely in accordance with national guidance as set out in TAN15 and therefore the site should be re-allocated. This analysis has been provided to the Environment Agency for review in accordance with the comments made in their previous representations.</p> <p>The proposed change will ensure that the policies and allocation is realistic and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The proposed changes will also ensure that this key regeneration site is delivered.</p> <p>In accordance with the Planning Inspectorate Wales guidance 'A Guide to the Examination of Local Development Plans', the updated FCA will be forwarded once ratified by the Environment Agency. The document makes specific reference to the need to consider flood risk assessments in making site allocations. The results of the detailed work including on site analysis and up to date 2D hydraulic modelling lead to a very different conclusion to the desk based research exercise based on historic information commissioned to review all strategic sites. This provides sufficient justification to consider this updated FCA when available.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed change will satisfy tests C1, C2, C3 and CE2 below.</p> <p>C1 - The proposed development is entirely in accordance with all other relevant policies;                      C2 - The development is entirely in line with national policy including TAN 15;                      C3 - The development accords with the Wales Spatial Plan;                      CE2 - The site was originally allocated for the uses proposed and the evidence base supporting that (updated FCA) demonstrates this to be robust.</p>														



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2048.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1168/ASD004 Former Cwm Colliery and Coking Works, Tyn-y-nant. (Policy SSA 7)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Yes

On behalf of CPL Industries Ltd, Amethyst objects to the exclusion of the Former Cwm Colliery and Coking Works strategic site allocation. Whilst we recognise the criteria applied to include sites on the deletion list, we would note that the proposed redevelopment of the site has been through extensive public consultation during the plan preparation process. During this process, only one objector proposed the deletion of the site. Having read the representations, the reason for proposing deletion of the site was to promote alternative land elsewhere for residential development. No other issues of concern have been raised by other parties.

These representations should be read in association with our previous representations and briefly summarise the benefits of the scheme.

The colliery is a large derelict brownfield site that needs to be redeveloped. The site is in a strategic and sustainable location that would help achieve the aims and objectives of the LDP.

The allocation of the Cwm Colliery and Coking Works will deliver significant benefits arising from the comprehensive decontamination and remediation of the coking works, colliery and spoil tips. The allocation will make a significant contribution towards rectifying the severe shortage of available housing land in the County Borough and will provide a range of employment and worthwhile community uses. The scheme will deliver 800 homes, including affordable housing with linked with environmental improvements across the site.

The Wales Spatial Plan sets the strategy for building sustainable communities, particularly in areas of deprivation. It identifies the South Wales Valleys and former industrial communities as those particularly in need of regeneration and investment. The former Cwm Coking Works site lies at the heart of the South Wales Valleys. The plan refers to the need to improve quality of life, retain and attract residents, and increase the prosperity of the whole area. Amongst other key objectives it identifies private house building as having a key role to play in the regeneration of the Valleys.

The allocation of the Cwm Colliery and Coking Works will significantly assist in meeting the key objectives of the Wales Spatial Plan. The allocation is in accordance with the guidance contained in Planning Policy Wales (2002), Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006 – Housing and Technical Advice Notes.

The allocation is situated close to an existing settlement well served by facilities, infrastructure and public transport. It proposes the redevelopment of previously developed brownfield land which will help to preserve greenfield sites and will provide a wide choice of high quality housing in a sustainable location. The allocation should be retained as it is in accordance with development plan policy and fully in line with the aims of national policy, providing particular support for objectives in respect of sustainable development and the re-use of derelict and contaminated land.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The inclusion of the Former Cwm Colliery and Coking Works strategic site allocation will ensure that the LDP meets the following Tests of Soundness:

Consistency Tests

C1 - It has regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or adjoining areas

C2 - It has regard to national policy

C3 - It has regard to Wales Spatial Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2048.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1165/ASD001						NSA 6 - Former Phurnacite Plant			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This representation objects to the inclusion of the site on the deletion register.  Our previous representations confirmed that CPL Industries is working with the Welsh Assembly Government on a master planning exercise for the site to deliver a scheme in broad accordance with the land uses proposed at paragraph 6.31 points (d) to (f) of the Deposit Plan. However, that allocation should be made as the main thrust of the policy rather than as an option to consider subject to satisfying other tests (which have now been satisfied). This representation is in addition to the representations made on the Deposit Plan which confirms that a Flood Consequence Assessment was being prepared in support of that master plan.  As a result of consultation with the Environment Agency and a detailed scoping exercise, specialist consulting engineers have recently completed detailed 2D river catchment hydraulic modelling. This analysis has been submitted to the Environment Agency for review and demonstrates that for both the Q100 and Q1000 events, residential development on the site is acceptable in the context of national planning policy requirements and specifically the requirements set out in TAN15.  The detailed modelling has been based on extensive on site analysis and accurate topographical survey information, therefore superseding the largely desk based flood risk assessments that were commissioned of all strategic sites and led to the removal of the housing allocation for the site.  On this basis, it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that the flood risk on site has been fully considered and should not act as a constraint to making a site specific allocation for around 500 residential units in accordance with the previous plan allocation. This contribution should then form part of the overall housing allocation.	Yes

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
------	----------	-------	-----------------

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
2	5			Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The former Phurnacite Plant was previously allocated for residential development in the LDP Preferred Strategy. The allocation was removed after desk based research raised concern over flooding.</p> <p>Detailed on site analysis and 2D hydraulic modelling has confirmed that residential development would be entirely in accordance with national guidance as set out in TAN15 and therefore the site should be re-allocated. This analysis has been provided to the Environment Agency for review in accordance with the comments made in their previous representations.</p> <p>The proposed change will ensure that the policies and allocation is realistic and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The proposed changes will also ensure that this key regeneration site is delivered.</p> <p>In accordance with the Planning Inspectorate Wales guidance 'A Guide to the Examination of Local Development Plans', the updated FCA will be forwarded once ratified by the Environment Agency. The document makes specific reference to the need to consider flood risk assessments in making site allocations. The results of the detailed work including on site analysis and up to date 2D hydraulic modelling lead to a very different conclusion to the desk based research exercise based on historic information commissioned to review all strategic sites. This provides sufficient justification to consider this updated FCA when available.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed change will satisfy tests C1, C2, C3 and CE2 below.</p> <p>C1 - The proposed development is entirely in accordance with all other relevant policies;                      C2 - The development is entirely in line with national policy including TAN 15;                      C3 - The development accords with the Wales Spatial Plan;                      CE2 - The site was originally allocated for the uses proposed and the evidence base supporting that (updated FCA) demonstrates this to be robust.</p>														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2048.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1014/ASN004						Former Phurnacite Plant			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This representation objects to the inclusion of the site on the deletion register.  Our previous representations confirmed that CPL Industries is working with the Welsh Assembly Government on a master planning exercise for the site to deliver a scheme in broad accordance with the land uses proposed at paragraph 6.31 points (d) to (f) of the Deposit Plan. However, that allocation should be made as the main thrust of the policy rather than as an option to consider subject to satisfying other tests (which have now been satisfied). This representation is in addition to the representations made on the Deposit Plan which confirms that a Flood Consequence Assessment was being prepared in support of that master plan.  As a result of consultation with the Environment Agency and a detailed scoping exercise, specialist consulting engineers have recently completed detailed 2D river catchment hydraulic modelling. This analysis has been submitted to the Environment Agency for review and demonstrates that for both the Q100 and Q1000 events, residential development on the site is acceptable in the context of national planning policy requirements and specifically the requirements set out in TAN15.  The detailed modelling has been based on extensive on site analysis and accurate topographical survey information, therefore superseding the largely desk based flood risk assessments that were commissioned of all strategic sites and led to the removal of the housing allocation for the site.  On this basis, it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that the flood risk on site has been fully considered and should not act as a constraint to making a site specific allocation for around 500 residential units in accordance with the previous plan allocation. This contribution should then form part of the overall housing allocation.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
------	----------	-------	-----------------

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?												
<p>The former Phurnacite Plant was previously allocated for residential development in the LDP Preferred Strategy. The allocation was removed after desk based research raised concern over flooding.</p> <p>Detailed on site analysis and 2D hydraulic modelling has confirmed that residential development would be entirely in accordance with national guidance as set out in TAN15 and therefore the site should be re-allocated. This analysis has been provided to the Environment Agency for review in accordance with the comments made in their previous representations.</p> <p>The proposed change will ensure that the policies and allocation is realistic and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The proposed changes will also ensure that this key regeneration site is delivered.</p> <p>In accordance with the Planning Inspectorate Wales guidance 'A Guide to the Examination of Local Development Plans', the updated FCA will be forwarded once ratified by the Environment Agency. The document makes specific reference to the need to consider flood risk assessments in making site allocations. The results of the detailed work including on site analysis and up to date 2D hydraulic modelling lead to a very different conclusion to the desk based research exercise based on historic information commissioned to review all strategic sites. This provides sufficient justification to consider this updated FCA when available.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed change will satisfy tests C1, C2, C3 and CE2 below.</p> <p>C1 - The proposed development is entirely in accordance with all other relevant policies;                      C2 - The development is entirely in line with national policy including TAN 15;                      C3 - The development accords with the Wales Spatial Plan;                      CE2 - The site was originally allocated for the uses proposed and the evidence base supporting that (updated FCA) demonstrates this to be robust.</p>														

<b>2052.A1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	C	M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Document:	Site: 859/ASN005 Site B opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers							PEX Session:							
Policy:	Map:							Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
<p>In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:</p> <p>1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:</p> <p>AS(N)5 - Site B, Abercynon: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YW line - 400,000 volt route from Swansea substation in Swansea through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly and ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.</p>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2052.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 936/ASN006						Land adjacent to Sewage treatment Works					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:		Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)6 - Land adj. Sewerage Works: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YW line - 400,000 volt route from Swansea substation in Swansea through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly and ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

<b>2052.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 966/ASN008						Land adjacent to Sewage treatment Works					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:		Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)8 - Land adj. Sewerage Works: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YW line - 400,000 volt route from Swansea substation in Swansea through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly and ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2052.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 997/ASN031 Llwynau Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)31 - Llwynau Farm : A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

<b>2052.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)64 - Land at Hirwaun: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YU line - 400,000 volt route from Pembroke substation in Pembrokeshire through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Rassau Substation.

2. National Grid High Pressure Gas Transmission pipelines (Feeder Gilwern/Rhigos, 2 Feeder Rhigos/Dyffryn Clydach) lay in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)64 - Land at Hirwaun: High pressure gas pipeline lay in vicinity of this site.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2052.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 851/ASN066 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:
2. National Grid High Pressure Gas Transmission pipelines (Feeder Gilwern/Rhigos, 2 Feeder Rhigos/Dyffryn Clydach) lay in the vicinity of the following sites:
- AS(N)66 - Land at Hirwaun: High pressure gas pipeline lay in vicinity of this site.

<b>2052.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 873/ASN067 Policy CS 9.2- Waste Management, Hirwaun Industri						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:
1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:
- AS(N)67 - Land at Hirwaun: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YU line - 400,000 volt route from Pembroke substation in Pembrokeshire through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Rassau Substation.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2052.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 894/ASN068						Hirwaun Industrial Estate			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)68 - Land at Hirwaun: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YU line - 400,000 volt route from Pembroke substation in Pembrokeshire through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Rassau Substation.

2. National Grid High Pressure Gas Transmission pipelines (Feeder Gilwern/Rhigos, 2 Feeder Rhigos/Dyffryn Clydach) lay in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)68 - Hirwaun Ind Estate: High pressure gas pipeline lay in vicinity of this site.

<b>2052.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 957/ASN071						Tower Colliery Pit Head Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

2. National Grid High Pressure Gas Transmission pipelines (Feeder Gilwern/Rhigos, 2 Feeder Rhigos/Dyffryn Clydach) lay in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)71 - Tower Colliery Pit Head: High pressure gas pipeline lay in vicinity of this site.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2052.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 958/ASN073						Land west of Mount Pleasant Inn				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:
2. National Grid High Pressure Gas Transmission pipelines (Feeder Gilwern/Rhigos, 2 Feeder Rhigos/Dyffryn Clydach) lay in the vicinity of the following sites:
- AS(N)73 - land west of Mt Pleasant: High pressure gas pipeline lay in vicinity of this site.

<b>2052.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 959/ASN074						Land between A465 and Treherbert Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:
2. National Grid High Pressure Gas Transmission pipelines (Feeder Gilwern/Rhigos, 2 Feeder Rhigos/Dyffryn Clydach) lay in the vicinity of the following sites:
- AS(N)74 - Land between A465 and Treherbert Road: High pressure gas pipeline lay in vicinity of this site.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2052.A12</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 932/ASN103 Land at Mwyndy						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)103 - Land at Mwyndy: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

<b>2052.A13</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 881/ASN120 Treforest Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)120 - Treforest Ind Estate: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2052.A14</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 892/ASN121 Land at Ty Draw, Gelliwion						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)121 - Ty Draw Gelliwion: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YW line - 400,000 volt route from Swansea substation in Swansea through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

<b>2052.A15</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 858/ASN126 Land at Halt Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)126 - Land at Holt Road: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: 4YU line - 400,000 volt route from Pembroke substation in Pembrokeshire through Rhondda Cynon Taf to Rassau Substation.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2052.A17</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1018/ASN137						Land at Talygarn			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)137 - Land at Talygarn: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

<b>2052.A18</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 983/ASN158						Land at Treforest Industrial Estate			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

In relation to the additional/alternative site allocations outlined within the current consultation, we can advise that the following National Grid infrastructure is relevant:

1. Overhead lines exist in the vicinity of the following sites:

AS(N)158 - Treforest Ind Estate: A high voltage overhead electricity line runs adjacent to this site: ZZB line - 275 kv from Aberthaw in Vale of Glamorgan to Upper Boat substation in Rhondda Cynon Taf to Cilfynydd substation in Caerphilly.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>2055.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 955/ASN019 Land adjacent to High Mead						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The land adjacent to High Mead in Beddau should be included in the Housing Land Allocation in the new LDP and the Settlement Boundary for Beddau should be extended to include this land.

The fields adjoining the A473 in Beddau are bounded by the A473 to the West, High Mead to the South, the disused railway line and Church Village Bypass to the East and the lane to Rhiwsaeson to the North.

In the current version of the LDP the proposed site is designated as 'white land'.

The fields are a brown field site having previously been the location of a coal mine with adit, a concrete block works and a transfer station for cattle en-route to the old slaughter houses in Pontypridd. The mine shaft is still visible and exposed today, though attempts to fill the shaft have been made by previous occupiers of the site. Over half of the site has been subjected to significant hardcore landfill (in excess of 3m in the southern part) to provide an alternative access for the then operational Rhiwsaeson municipal refuse tip to the east of the fields, but this access was never completed and adopted due to the closure of the tip. The northern part of the site has also been subject to significant landfill (approx 0.5m - 1m).

The fields have been disused, in the truest meaning of the word, for over 18 years and the fields are no longer viable for livestock or horses, etc as the boundaries are not secure due to vandalism and rot. Furthermore, it is not economically viable to repair the fences for livestock usage as the payback period would be in excess of 25 years. The fields are not suitable for crops or hay because the soil is of inferior quality and indeed the southern half of the site has only a very thin dusting of soil over the previous landfill.

The fields are currently plagued with constant fly-tipping and vandalism and are a haven for anti-social behaviour such as under-age drinking and drug taking on the premises. Previous occupiers of the site complained of many attacks on their livestock from local youths. In recent years the owner has attempted to improve the appearance of the fields and deter further fly-tipping by clearing all of the fly-tipped material and the stone and paving from the demolished service buildings relating to the old coalmine and concrete block works. This work was undertaken to avoid any potential enforcement action from the LPA and the fields have been re-seed, though this work has been superficial.

Considering Planning Policy Wales 2002, Figure 2.1 - definition of previously developed land - this site is clearly a brownfield site previously used for mineral extraction and remains in a largely un-restored state with the mine shaft still exposed, uncapped and a potential safety hazard, though the shaft does to have filled in over time by previous owners of the land. All remains of the surface buildings from the coal mine and concrete block works have recently been used to fill the old dried up ditches and culverts on the site, though these can be uncovered for verification during a site visit if required.

MIPPS 01/2006 makes a clear distinction between development adjoining a settlement, development in the countryside and development in open countryside. With reference to these definitions, the site being proposed falls into the category of adjoining a settlement especially given the extended settlement boundary to include the significant housing development SSA 10.15 as proposed in the new LDP.

In policy SSA 10, reference 15 refers to land south of Brynteg Court in Beddau, which is a green field and was, until recently, used for agriculture as part of a working farm. SSA 10.15 has already been included in the land proposed. According to MIPPS 01/2006 brownfield sites should be allocated fro development before greenfield sites (MIPPS 9.2.10), but because of the process and policies adopted by the Council to identify Candidate sites for the LDP this proposed alternative site was excluded from the list of candidate sites even though I had consistently and continually progressed development of the site through the local planning process over the past 10 years or so. This procedure adopted by the Council has caused an inconsistently with regard to MIPPS 01/2006 and National directives and policies on development land search sequence.

When considering the housing objectives of the Welsh Assembly Government, by considering the contents of MIPPS 2006 there is a good 'fit' with the proposed alternative and the objectives that the Welsh Assembly Government wish to achieve:

1. Paragraph 3.1.1 states that "The Welsh Assembly Government will seek to ensure that: Previously developed land (see definition at figure 2.1) is used in preference to greenfield sites. The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of affordable and market housing.

2. Paragraph 3.1.2 states that "...Local planning authorities should promote:

Development that is easily accessible by public transport, cycling and walking...

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l	SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<p>The proposed site is within 200m of bus stops serving routes to Pontypridd (serving Treforest and Pontypridd railway stations), Cardiff Centre, Talbot Green (with links to Pontyclun and Bridgend railway stations) and the Royal Glamorgan Hospital. There are no steep routes to the bus stops. The site is within 100 m of the new community cycle route being constructed as part of the new Church Village Bypass and abuts the proposed new railway station at Beddau</p>															
Item Question															Soundness Tests
Reply															

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

P1 - It has not been prepared in accordance with the Delivery Agreement, including the Community Involvement Scheme.

P2 - The plan and its policies have not been subjected to a Sustainability Appraisal including Strategic Environmental Assessment. - Unsure

Consistency Tests

C1, C2, C3 and C4 - MIPPS 01/2006 clearly defines a search sequence to be followed when identifying development land. A significant, greenfield, recently productive farmland site of circa 12 acres on the opposite side of the A473 from the site has been allocated for housing development (SSA 10.15) in the LDP in preference to this alternative brownfield site. This is contra to national policies and inclusion of this alternative brownfield site into the housing land allocation is required to overcome this inconsistency between LPA implementation and National and Local Policies.

Including this proposed site within the housing allocation will provide a sustainable and effective use for this previously developed land and will provide a logical and sensible extension to the settlement boundary for Beddau, fully compliant with Welsh and National Government housing objectives.

Coherence & Effectiveness Tests

CE1, CE2, CE3 and CE4 - MIPPS 01/2006 makes clear distinction between developments which are adjacent to settlement, in the countryside and in open countryside. Clearly, with the new major road development of the Church Village Bypass to the south and east of the settlement of Beddau, there is a new physical and psychological barrier between Beddau and the countryside beyond. This has the effect of pushing the proposed site within the logical and perceived settlement boundary of Beddau. Additionally, the re-opening of the railway line will further add to the arguments for including the proposed site in the settlement of Beddau. With the construction of the Church Village Bypass the proposed site now has more attributes and character akin to the settlement of Beddau than the countryside beyond from which the proposed site has now been physically severed.

In light of the MIPPS distinction of developments adjacent to settlements, and the extension of the settlement boundary in the new LDP to include the major housing development SSA 10.15 it is reasonable to treat development of the proposed site as 'adjacent to the (extended) settlement of Beddau as defined in the new LDP. Since the settlement boundary itself is being reviewed as part of the LDP evolution it is a reasonable proposition to further extend the settlement boundary to include this proposed site and up to the new physical boundary of Church Village Bypass adjacent to this proposed site.

The new LDP has not fully taken into account the changing circumstances and character of the area resulting from the construction of the Church Village bypass major road scheme and the proposed large-scale housing development SSA 10.15. Consequently the various changes contained within the new LDP and the developments actually taking place in the locality have resulted in the proposed site being isolated and 'out of character' in the area. It is argued that development of the proposed site is therefore considered infill between the extended settlement of Beddau (including SSA 10.15) and the Church Village Bypass.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2055.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1168/ASD004 Former Cwm Colliery and Coking Works, Tyn-y-nant. (Policy SSA 7)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? No

The proposals for the Cwm Colliery Redevelopment should be withdrawn from the Local Development Plan and should not proceed any further.

In September 2006 there was a Public Inquiry into the redevelopment of the Cwm Colliery and Coking Works site along the same proposals as those in the current version of the LDP draft. CPL lost the Public Inquiry and the Welsh Assembly Inspector threw out the proposals, concluding that the site was not suitable for housing redevelopment due to, but not limited to, contaminated and poisonous land that would affect the health of occupiers of the redeveloped land.

Nothing significant has changed since the conclusion of the Public Inquiry conducted by the Welsh Assembly Inspectorate since September 2006;

Planning policy has not changed, either at local or national level, indeed MIPPS 2006 was effective at the time of the Inquiry

The character and amenity of the area is similar to that at the time of the Inquiry in 2006. There have been no changes in infrastructure nor other developments in the area to enable a claim of changing circumstances

The proposal has not changed significantly since the last Welsh Assembly Inspector turned down the proposals

Even though national and local planning policies support redevelopment of brownfield sites for housing, this was the policy that was in operation at the time of the Public Inquiry into the scheme in September 2006, and despite this the re-development was turned down by the Welsh Assembly Government.

Let's not waste any more public money by following a proposal that has already been scrutinised and deemed inappropriate, and let's listen to the views of the local people in Beddau who successfully fought against the redevelopment proposals and won their case at the Public Inquiry.

Subsequent to the Inquiry, the people of Beddau were promised a public amenity, similar to a country park, so let's not progress a policy which has already been determined and concluded that housing and employment development on the Cwm Colliery site is inappropriate and NOT in the public interest.

In addition to the concerns already raised at the Inquiry in 2006, should the proposed development progress there would be substantial issues in the areas of:

- hazardous waste on the site
- traffic issues on Parish Road and the new 'Cadwallader Yard' junction. NB these will not be resolved by the construction of the Church Village Bypass.
- the sustainability of providing yet another primary school in Beddau when existing primary pupil numbers in the villages are in decline and existing school facilities have spare places.

In my view there has been one significant change that has taken place since the conclusions of the Public Inquiry into the scheme in 2006, and that is the attitude of the local residents. Since the re-development proposal was turned down at the Public Inquiry in 2006, local residents have assumed (quite correctly) that the re-development proposals were dead and buried once and for all, and that is probably why there have been few representations against the re-development scheme during these LDP consultations.

To approve the Cwm Colliery and Coking Works Redevelopment scheme now would go against mass local opposition and not reflect the democratic view of the residents.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>											<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>		
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?													
		C1 – Approval of this re-development scheme would not only go against huge local opposition and feelings, but would also go against the decision of the Public Inquiry in 2006 and the conclusions of the Welsh Assembly Government.													
		C2 – Even though national policy is to re-develop brownfield sites for housing, the Public Inquiry into the scheme in September 2006 turned down the re-development proposals, and nothing materially has changed since that decision.													
		CE2 – The Public Inquiry into this re-development scheme in 2006 concluded that the re-development should not be undertaken. It was concluded that using the site for housing was not safe and posed health risks to occupants, amongst other issues, and so it was concluded that the re-development plans, although desirable were unrealistic and unworkable. Nothing materially has changed to negate that conclusion.													
		An alternative proposal to provide some form of public amenity land or heritage park should be considered as an alternative scheme, which would be perfectly realistic and welcomed by the local residents of Beddau and Tyn-y-nant.													

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>2055.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1061/ASS013 Land adjacent to High Mead						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The land adjacent to High Mead in Beddau should be included in the Housing Land Allocation in the new LDP and the Settlement Boundary for Beddau should be extended to include this land.

Thr fields adjoining the A473 in Beddau are bounded by the A473 to the West, High Mead to the South, the disused railway line and Church Village Bypass to the East and the lane to Rhiwsaeson to the North.

In the current version of the LDP the proposed site is designated as 'white land'.

The fields are a brown field site having previously been the location of a coal mine with adit, a concrete block works and a transfer station for cattle en-route to the old slaughter houses in Pontypridd. The mine shaft is still visible and exposed today, though attempts to fill the shaft have been made by previous occupiers of the site. Over half of the site has been subjected to significant hardcore landfill (in excess of 3m in the southern part) to provide an alternative access for the then operational Rhiwsaeson municiple refuse tip to the east of the fields, but this access was never completed and adopted due to the closure of the tip. The northern part of the site has also been subject to significant landfill (approx 0.5m - 1m).

The fields have been disused, in the truest meaning of the word, for over 18 years and the fields are no longer viable for livestock or horses, etc as the boundaries are not secure due to vandalism and rot. Furthermore, it is not economically viable to repair the fences for livestock usage as the payback period would be in excess of 25 years. The fields are not suitable for crops or hay because the soil is of inferior quality and indeed the southern half of the site has only a very thin dusting of soil over the previous landfill.

The fields are currently plagued with constant fly-tipping and vandalism and are a haven for anti-social behaviour such as under-age drinking and drug taking on the premises. Previous occupiers of the site complained of many attacks on their livestock from local youths. In recent years the owner has attempted to improve the appearance of the fields and deter further fly-tipping by clearing all of the fly-tipped material and the stone and paving from the demolished service buildings relating to the old coalmine and concrete block works. This work was undertaken to avoid any potential enforcement action from the LPA and the fields have been re-seed, though this work has been superficial.

Considering Planning Policy Wales 2002, Figure 2.1 - definition of previously developed land - this site is clearly a brownfield site previously used for mineral extraction and remains in a largely un-restored state with the mine shaft still exposed, uncapped and a potential safety hazard, though the shaft does to have filled in over time by previous owners of the land. All remains of the surface buildings from the coal mine and concrete block works have recently been used to fill the old dried up ditches and culverts on the site, though these can be uncovered for verification during a site visit if required.

MIPPS 01/2006 makes a clear distinction between development adjoining a settlement, development in the countryside and development in open countryside. With reference to these definitions, the site being proposed falls into the category of adjoining a settlement especially given the extended settlement boundary to include the significant housing development SSA 10.15 as proposed in the new LDP.

In policy SSA 10, reference 15 refers to land south of Brynteg Court in Beddau, which is a green field and was, until recently, used for agriculture as part of a working farm. SSA 10.15 has already been included in the land proposed. According to MIPPS 01/2006 brownfield sites should be allocated for development before greenfield sites (MIPPS 9.2.10), but because of the process and policies adopted by the Council to identify Candidate sites for the LDP this proposed alternative site was excluded from the list of candidate sites even though I had consistently and continually progressed development of the site through the local planning process over the past 10 years or so. This procedure adopted by the Council has caused an inconsistency with regard to MIPPS 01/2006 and National directives and policies on development land search sequence.

When considering the housing objectives of the Welsh Assembly Government, by considering the contents of MIPPS 2006 there is a good 'fit' with the proposed alternative and the objectives that the Welsh Assembly Government wish to achieve:

1. Paragraph 3.1.1 states that "The Welsh Assembly Government will seek to ensure that previously developed land (see definition at figure 2.1) is used in preference to greenfield sites. The overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of affordable and market housing.

2. Paragraph 3.1.2 states that "...Local planning authorities should promote:

Development that is easily accessible by public transport, cycling and walking...

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l	SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<p>The proposed site is within 200m of bus stops serving routes to Pontypridd (serving Treforest and Pontypridd railway stations), Cardiff Centre, Talbot Green (with links to Pontyclun and Brdgend railway stations) and the Royal Glamorgan Hospital. There are no steep routes to the bus stops. The site is within 100 m of the new community cycle route being constructed as part of the new churchVillage Bypass and abutts the proposed new railway station at Beddau</p>															
Item Question										Reply			Soundness Tests		

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

P1 - It has not been prepared in accordance with the Delivery Agreement, including the Community Involvement Scheme.

P2 - The plan and its policies have not been subjected to a Sustainability Appraisal including Strategic Environmental Assessment. - Unsure

Consistency Tests

C1, C2, C3 and C4 - MIPPS 01/2006 clearly defines a search sequence to be followed when identifying development land. A significant, greenfield, recently productive farmland site of circa 12 acres on the opposite side of the A473 from the site has been allocated for housing development (SSA 10.15) in the LDP in preference to this alternative brownfield site. This is contra to national policies and inclusion of this alternative brownfield site into the housing land allocation is required to overcome this inconsistency between LPA implementation and National and Local Policies.

Including this proposed site within the housing allocation will provide a sustainable and effective use for this previously developed land and will provide a logical and sensible extension to the settlement boundary for Beddau, fully compliant with Welsh and National Government housing objectives.

Coherence & Effectiveness Tests

CE1, CE2, CE3 and CE4 - MIPPS 01/2006 makes clear distinction between developments which are adjacent to settlement, in the countryside and in open countryside. Clearly, with the new major road development of the Church Village Bypass to the south and east of the settlement of Beddau, there is a new physical and psychological barrier between Beddau and the countryside beyond. This has the effect of pushing the proposed site within the logical and perceived settlement boundary of Beddau. Additionally, the re-opening of the railway line will further add to the arguments for including the proposed site in the settlement of Beddau. With the construction of the Church Village Bypass the proposed site now has more attributes and character akin to the settlement of Beddau than the countryside beyond from which the proposed site has now been physically severed.

In light of the MIPPS distinction of developments adjacent to settlements, and the extension of the settlement boundary in the new LDP to include the major housing development SSA 10.15 it is reasonable to treat development of the proposed site as 'adjacent to the (extended) settlement of Beddau as defined in the new LDP. Since the settlement boundary itself is being reviewed as part of the LDP evolution it is a reasonable proposition to further extend the settlement boundary to include this proposed site and up to the new physical boundary of Church Village Bypass adjacent to this proposed site.

The new LDP has not fully taken into account the changing circumstances and character of the area resulting from the construction of the Church Village bypass major road scheme and the proposed large-scale housing development SSA 10.15. Consequently the various changes contained within the new LDP and the developments actually taking place in the locality have resulted in the proposed site being isolated and 'out of character' in the area. It is argued that development of the proposed site is therefore considered infill between the extended settlement of Beddau (including SSA 10.15) and the Church Village Bypass.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2073.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2080.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 932/ASN103 Land at Mwyndy						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Support the mixed-use allocation of this site which includes land controlled by Maxibrite Ltd (Refs 2025 and 3413).  A mix of industrial, commercial and residential development is considered acceptable for this site although its delivery should not be predicated upon the removal of the Maxibrite plant (see covering letter).	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The inclusion of the site for the uses proposed has regard to National Policy and the Wales Spatial Plan is realistic and appropriate and should ensure that the plan is reasonably felxible in order that it is able to deal with chaning circumstances.		

<b>2094.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 995/ASN022 Land adjacent to 'Greenway'						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Under the old ECT Community Plan this site was rejected twice by the Planning Authority and appeal to the Welsh Inspectorate (also twice) was refused.  The grounds for the refusal were: A) The site is situated well outside the settlement boundary. B) It would cause harm to the landscape. C) It would lead to sporadic development in the countryside.  The site proposers have never properly or satisfactorily addressed these issues.  Regarding paragraph A) above the proposed new settlement boundary when contrasted to the previous boundary location puts the site in ever further isolation from proposed settlement zones.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It is a land use plan which does not have regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or adjoining area.  It does not have regard to the Rhondda Cynon Taff Community Plan.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>2101.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 896/ASN070 Land rear of Bute Terrace						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I object to the inclusion of this site for residential development. The site assessment methodology correctly identified that this site is an important community amenity for recreation and a SINC site.	

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? C1, C4, CE2  P1 - The community have expressed clear objections to the use of the site for anything other than recreation and leisure.		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2224.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2224.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2228.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1020/ASN101						Land at Maes y Dderwen			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The road network in Caegarw will not be able to adequately deal with such increased volumes. There is no pavement at lower Aberffrwd Road. The housing site will be built at the foot of the Ffrwd Tip - drainage from the tip allows it to remain stable. The hydrology will be affected over the whole area. AN ancient woodland will be destroyed and natural habitats. I don't understand how Parc Aberpennar is included in the sites - a petition (Feb 08) opposing the inclusion of the park in the LDP (land ay Maes-y Dderwen) was handed in to the Local Authority by Councillor Pauline Jarman. Caegarw has two recent housing sites at Trawsgoed and Trem-y-Dyffryn. This site is landlocked.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The area already has mortality and morbidity ratios worse than other areas in Western Europe. It needs a green lung element that encourages outdoor activity and protects its wildlife. This site will adversely affect the ecology of the area, creating noise /light and air pollution. The infrastructure (Roads/Sewage/Water) cannot cope with such a massive increase. A natural beauty spot will be destroyed without enhancing the natural elements but destroy them.		

<b>2228.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1099/ASS054						Land at Maes y Dderwen, Aberffrwd			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The road network in Caegarw will not be able to adequately deal with such increased volumes. There is no pavement at lower Aberffrwd Road. The housing site will be built at the foot of the Ffrwd Tip - drainage from the tip allows it to remain stable. The hydrology will be affected over the whole area. AN ancient woodland will be destroyed and natural habitats. I don't understand how Parc Aberpennar is included in the sites - a petition (Feb 08) opposing the inclusion of the park in the LDP (land ay Maes-y Dderwen) was handed in to the Local Authority by Councillor Pauline Jarman. Caegarw has two recent housing sites at Trawsgoed and Trem-y-Dyffryn. This site is landlocked.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The area already has mortality and morbidity ratios worse than other areas in Western Europe. It needs a green lung element that encourages outdoor activity and protects its wildlife. This site will adversely affect the ecology of the area, creating noise /light and air pollution. The infrastructure (Roads/Sewage/Water) cannot cope with such a massive increase. A natural beauty spot will be destroyed without enhancing the natural elements but destroy them.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>2228.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1020/ASN101 Land at Maes y Dderwen						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Although a new application has been made the present plan looks very similar to the earlier application under the Deposit Draft Plan that was rejected on the grounds of site of importance nature conservation, and topography. There appears to be no difference in the application other than a marginal increase in the area for residential development. The reasons for the initial rejection I believe to be extant, sensitive to the needs of the area and reflects an overwhelming desire from local residents to further eject this application as commercial opportunism, exploitation of natura habitats and knowingly and destructively creating major blot on a beautiful landscape and imposing on the local community a burden of forces that will wreck any meaningful cohesive living on those who will witness pollution of noise, light, traffic and infrastructure networks on the built environment that is effectively Victorian in design.

If this application is approved it will inflict on the area and its wildlife a carnage and destruction of flora and fauna witnessed only at the height of the coal industries' exploitation of the environment and with it the exploitation of those who lived in and through it.

The proposed development area cannot and should not be developed for many important and interlinked environmental, topographical and ecological concerns (the delicate balance of nature and the environment with the landscape, a mountain region) and the know restrictions on the sensible number of residents that can live together in a community with limited and finite resources, antiquated road networks that were never designed to carry the current volume of traffic it is required to now, and the sewage and utilities services that will be overstretched to breaking point and put enormous pressure on the present infrastructure. If the proposed developments go ahead then it will put an enormous stress on the whole fabric of our life as we know it and obliterate landscape and its ecology for this and future generations. The application is an outrage on all that is decent and moral.

I would like to develop a number of key issues as an illustration of the magnitude of this development and the practical impact it will have on the life and future of the area if it's included in the LDP.

Parc Aberpennar - First the area of the development includes Parc Aberpennar in its totality. Currently owned by the Local Authority and used by the community for purpose of leisure and recreation (and has been since the 1950's). Local residents have campaigned for the ownership to remain in the hands of the Local Council for the exclusive purpose of leisure and recreation and object to the inclusion of it in the Local Development Plan as a then Candidate Site for housing under the title of Land at Maes y Dderwen. After a number of local petitions in February 2008 objecting to Parc Aberpennar's inclusion in the Local Development Plan as well as objecting to the park being used for any other purpose including accommodating any proposals regarding the exploration of working of the near by Ffrwd tip. A petition of nearly 400 signatures dealing with the concerns of Parc Aberpennar and the Ffrwd Tip names presented to the 26th February 2008 Council meeting by Councillor Pauline Jarman. There is still concern as to how a private developer can include a public park in a residential development project.

Road network in Caegarw - The road network in Caegarw is already under stress with the recent introduction of a complex and comprehensive one way system and extensive road calming measures. There is always road congestion at the junction at the main road with traffic seeking to either turn left towards the town or right towards Aberdare (and which is dangerous manoeuvre at the best of times).

The promised cross valley link with a major roundabout at this point has not materialised. It has brought significant traffic flows with the main ingress and egress into Caegarw via the narrow and inadequate Aberffrw Road. This road has no pavement at its lower end which currently makes it dangerous for pedestrians as it currently is and narrows to a single track (again no pavement) as it intersects with Granville Terrace. It's at this point where the development plans its access to the residential site that compounds all the current problems of road safety, visibility, pedestrian access to lower Aberffrw Road, and an already inadequate width to the lower end of Aberffrw Road.

Ffrwd Tip - The residential site will sit below a substantial disused coal tip site that was last tipped upon about 100 years ago. It's a combination of small lumps of coal and waste that a developer has been seeking to reclaim over many years. The tip is land locked and has no access point. The waste from Dyffryn colliery was moved there by tram and overhead bucket driven by engine houses (remains still visible today). It's become a local beauty spot and a part of the mountain side.

The key to its continued safety and stability is the highly effective drainage system and composition that allows easy and quick release of the rain through a porous mixture/tip constituent. It will be a dangerous development to seek to disturb the water flows in and around the base of the tip. There is, given the large land mass of the tip and torrent of the released water from out of and off the tip that gathers in a kind of delta of water at the base and down through streams and water ways.

A large residential development will adversely affect the water flows and tip stability.

Flooding in Caegarw - There is a long history of flooding throughout the area from each of the streams that drop off the step contours of the mountain including the Ffrwd brook, those around the cemetery and at the brook adjacent to the hospital drive. There is recorded flooding of the homes at the new housing estate Trem-y-Dyffryn.

Ancient Woodland - is a blessing to the area: rich in wildlife and undisturbed for centuries being part of the original natural ecology and greenery of the area. The destruction of these trees will be a

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

travesty and sheer hypocrisy to the need to protect our natural woodlands and wildlife.

Mortality and Morbidity Rates - Rates for the area are worse than anywhere in the whole of Western Europe. Access to green space and encouraging outdoor activity is regarded as essential building blocks to a healthy population. Population density, if you exclude these upper reaches will compare with the high population density anywhere in Wales.

Access to green space and green lung is a known positive influence on endangering healthy living and a help in counteracting poor mental health and encouraging outdoor activity. Obesity and associated poor health through inactivity and lack of exercise is demonstrated in the area.

The destruction of the local environment through the unregulated primary extractive industries together with a rancid Abercwmboi Phurnacite Plan (Dante's inferno) created major present day disadvantages where everything was second place to industrial pollution and the creation of poor local environments. This application for a major residential housing development together with the hospital site development will have the same devastating environmental impact of local habitat destruction, noise and light pollution, a scarring of the countryside, human pollution and motor vehicle pollution. The site has been known over time as a land locked tranquil area, of natural beauty and a recognised treasure for wildlife and flora.

I urge the Authorities to respect the serious implication of a large housing site perched on unsuitable terrain and to respect the duty we have to protect our flora and fauna in the area as a living organism essential to our own well being and those who will be badly affected by its loss.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>2228.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1099/ASS054						Land at Maes y Dderwen, Aberffrd			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Although a new application has been made the present plan looks very similar to the earlier application under the Deposit Draft Plan that was rejected on the grounds of site of importance nature conservation, and topography. There appears to be no difference in the application other than a marginal increase in the area for residential development. The reasons for the initial rejection I believe to be extant, sensitive to the needs of the area and reflects an overwhelming desire from local residents to further eject this application as commercial opportunism, exploitation of natural habitats and knowingly and destructively creating major blot on a beautiful landscape and imposing on the local community a burden of forces that will wreck any meaningful cohesive living on those who will witness pollution of noise, light, traffic and infrastructure networks on the built environment that is effectively Victorian in design.

If this application is approved it will inflict on the area and its wildlife a carnage and destruction of flora and fauna witnessed only at the height of the coal industries' exploitation of the environment and with it the exploitation of those who lived in and through it.

The proposed development area cannot and should not be developed for many important and interlinked environmental, topographical and ecological concerns (the delicate balance of nature and the environment with the landscape, a mountain region) and the know restrictions on the sensible number of residents that can live together in a community with limited ad finite resources, antiquated road networks that were never designed to carry the current volume of traffic it is required to now, and the sewage and utilities services that will be overstretched to breaking point and put enormous pressure on the present infrastructure. If the proposed developments go ahead then it will put an enormous stress on the whole fabric of our life as we know it and obliterate landscape and its ecology for this and future generations. The application is an outrage on all that is decent and moral.

I would like to develop a number of key issues as an illustration of the magnitude of this development and the practical impact it will have on the life and future of the area if it's included in the LDP.

Parc Aberpennar - First the area of the development includes Parc Aberpennar in its totality. Currently owned by the Local Authority and used by the community for purpose of leisure and recreation (and has been since the 1950's). Local residents have campaigned for the ownership to remain in the hands of the Local Council for the exclusive purpose of leisure and recreation and object to the inclusion of it in the Local Development Plan as a then Candidate Site for housing under the title of Land at Maes y Dderwen. After a number of local petitions in February 2008 objecting to Parc Aberpennar's inclusion in the Local Development Plan as well as objecting to the park being used for any other purpose including accommodating any proposals regarding the exploration of working of the near by Ffrwd tip. A petition of nearly 400 signatures dealing with the concerns of Parc Aberpennar and the Ffrwd Tip names presented to the 26th February 2008 Council meeting by Councillor Pauline Jarman. There is still concern as to how a private developer can include a public park in a residential development project.

Road network in Caegarw - The road network in Caegarw is already under stress with the recent introduction of a complex and comprehensive one way system and extensive road calming measures. There is always road congestion at the junction at the main road with traffic seeking to either turn left towards the town or right towards Aberdare (and which is dangerous manoeuvre at the best of times).

The promised cross valley link with a major roundabout at this point has not materialised. It has brought significant traffic flows with the main ingress and egress into Caegarw via the narrow and inadequate Aberffrwd Road. This road has no pavement at its lower end which currently makes it dangerous for pedestrians as it currently is and narrows to a single track (again no pavement) as it intersects with Granville Terrace. It's at this point where the development plans its access to the residential site that compounds all the current problems of road safety, visibility, pedestrian access to lower Aberffrwd Road, and an already inadequate width to the lower end of Aberffrwd Road.

Ffrwd Tip - The residential site will sit below a substantial disused coal tip site that was last tipped upon about 100 years ago. It's a combination of small lumps of coal and waste that a developer has been seeking to reclaim over many years. The tip is land locked and has no access point. The waste from Dyffryn colliery was moved there by tram and overhead bucket driven by engine houses (remains still visible today). It's become a local beauty spot and a part of the mountain side.

The key to its continued safety and stability is the highly effective drainage system and composition that allows easy and quick release of the rain through a porous mixture/tip constituent. It will be a dangerous development to seek to disturb the water flows in and around the base of the tip. There is, given the large land mass of the tip and torrent of the released water from out of and off the tip that gathers in a kind of delta of water at the base and down through streams and water ways.

A large residential development will adversely affect the water flows and tip stability.

Flooding in Caegarw - There is a long history of flooding throughout the area from each of the streams that drop off the step contours of the mountain including the Ffrwd brook, those around the cemetery and at the brook adjacent to the hospital drive. There is recorded flooding of the homes at the new housing estate Trem-y-Dyffryn.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
														<p>Ancient Woodland - is a blessing to the area: rich in wildlife and undisturbed for centuries being part of the original natural ecology and greenery of the area. The destruction of these trees will be a travesty and sheer hypocrisy to the need to protect our natural woodlands and wildlife.</p> <p>Mortality and Morbidity Rates - Rates for the area are worse than anywhere in the whole of Western Europe. Access to green space and encouraging outdoor activity is regarded as essential building blocks to a healthy population. Population density, if you exclude these upper reaches will compare with the high population density anywhere in Wales.</p> <p>Access to green space and green lung is a known positive influence on endangering healthy living and a help in counteracting poor mental health and encouraging outdoor activity. Obesity and associated poor health through inactivity and lack of exercise is demonstrated in the area.</p> <p>The destruction of the local environment through the unregulated primary extractive industries together with a rancid Abercwmboi Phurnacite Plan (Dante's inferno) created major present day disadvantages where everything was second place to industrial pollution and the creation of poor local environments. This application for a major residential housing development together with the hospital site development will have the same devastating environmental impact of local habitat destruction, noise and light pollution, a scarring of the countryside, human pollution and motor vehicle pollution. The site has been known over time as a land locked tranquil area, of natural beauty and a recognised treasure for wildlife and flora.</p> <p>I urge the Authorities to respect the serious implication of a large housing site perched on unsuitable terrain and to respect the duty we have to protect out flora and fauna in the area as a living organism essential to our own well being and those who will be badly affected by its loss.</p>

<b>2228.A5</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Document:														Site: 865/ASN102 Mountain Ash General Hospital PEX Session:
Policy:														Map: Issue:
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The whole area has suffered deforestation and now a legacy of a mountain full of conifer trees. A deciduous tree enclave as this site is, is indeed rare and has survived only because it has (still is) a hospital. The idea was tranquility. Now even this site of natural beauty and a natural habitat for wildlife and flora is threatened with destruction. All because of commercial greed by the NHS which is one of the most well funded of all public services and with commitments from the major political parties to continue to do so. They are as bas as the coal barons that headed misery on this area and wanton destruction. There is no difference.</p>

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>Does the NHS Cwmtaf - who purport to care about the health and wellbeing of the residents here really believe that this residential area will improve the mortality and morbidity ratios now at the worst levels in the whole of Western Europe - by destroying everything that encourages outdoor life (it might improve health not by walking through natrual habitat but through a large housing estate. Well done the NHS!</p>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2244.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
2244.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2245.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2245.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2248.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? No  
I will be attending the public enquiry to elaborate on my previous input of the Draft Document.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
It is consistent with the soundness test, as it is a constrained site.

<b>2256.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1067/ASS091 Playing Field at Cwmbach Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
It is using up part of what I now a pleasant green buffer zone between communities in Abernant/Plasdraw and Cwmbach. This area is constantly changing with its rich variety of flora and fauna. Such as, wild orchids, spring visiting birds and so on.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
Please refer to Q4

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2266.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M		Yes	459	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 953/ASN011 Cwm Farm										PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:					Issue:								
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I believe that no development should take place on this site, it is on the boundary of the Dare Valley Country Park. The natural beauty of this area would be lost it has been like this for many years. There are old trees on this site, they too would be lost if development was allowed, also have they found any rare plants and flowers, wildlife may be lost, are there any bats living in the many trees on this site. I think that the settlement boundary should not be moved for this proposed development, it should stay in place, and you should reject this new site. Cwm Farm fields are part of the Dare Valley Country Park.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

I believe that this area of land is of natural beauty to all and if this site is allowed to be part of the new LDP, harm will occur to the countryside. The Dare Valley Country Park would be damaged fro ever and all the natural habit will be lost.

Have consideration been given to the road and highway infrastructure as access to this site is only up Monk Street which is a very busy and dangerous road along highland place to Harlech Place at present we are having major problems at the moment due to the extra traffic going to the Country Park since the new caravan development up there. I have also seen a plan for the new roadway along the old railway line, this dead end road is used by many to walk their dogs, children play there, the entrance which they would like to use is on a very steep hill road where many accidents have occurred, have thought been given for the extra drainage and sewage, how much of the Country Park road would be taken up with the new access to the site which will be in the park and this is greenfield which will be needed. The Dare Valley Country Park is fro people to enjoy and not have any development. This site will not improve the soundness of the LDP, it will only make matters worse and it goes against all Rhondda-Cynon-Taf policies regarding greenfields sites and conservation areas. You must not agree to this site.

<b>2266.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1058/ASS090 Land at Graig Place										PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:					Issue:								
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I support the amend residential settlement boundary that it should be excluded from the residential settlement boundary.

I belive that this should be excluded from the LDP; the access to this will be on a very step hill, a majior accident could happen if this development went forward. This land was used as a water treatment works the ground could be contamited

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Again has thought been given to this land at present it is a green field site and is out side the LDP. I belive that wildlife does live on this site.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2268.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 I believe that the settlement boundary should be maintained to protect the unique landscape that is Penpych. I am told this the only 3 sided flat topped mountain in Europe.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 This proposal fails on the Procedural Test P1 and P2.  
 It fails of the Consistency tests C1 C2 C3 and C4.  
 It also fails on Coherence and Effectiveness Tests CE2.

<b>2268.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1019/ASN025						Former Stelco Hardy Site				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 The site would primarily be for employment for we are very short of such sites in the Rhondda. I would not however exclude uses for the wider community.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 This is an important site and to leave out of the original LDP was a major weakness. I believe (SP) it passes the procedural and Consistence tests.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2268.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 921/ASN021 Land off Michael's Road (Rhondda LP allocation - E						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 There is a need to protect the exceptional landscape of Blaencwm from inappropriate housing development. This site should therefore be used to promote tourism to the Upper Rhondda.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 The plan passes all the Consistency Tests and the relevant Coherence and Effectiveness Tests.

<b>2268.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 995/ASN022 Land adjacent to 'Greenway'						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 This is a particularly beautiful site away from the main residential of the village of Blaenycwm. Developing this will I believe have an adverse effect on Tourism to the area particularly with regard Ty Draw and Penpych Picnic Site and the walk way up Penpych.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 It does not adhere to procedural test P1  
 It fails on the Consistency test C1, C2, C3 and C4.  
 It fails on the Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE1.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2268.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I support the designation of this site for Tourism and Leisure as in previous Rhondda Plan. The site has great tourism potential being situated in my opinion the most beautiful area in Rhondda Cynon Taf and possibly in the whole of the South Wales Valleys. Its allocation for 400 or 800 houses is totally impractical. Access will be very difficult and the community formed would be isolated with no jobs for its residents locally.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

I think its inclusion would strengthen the LDP in providing a sustainable future for the upper Rhondda Fawr, it therefore passes the Procedural Consistency Coherence and Effectiveness Tests.

<b>2268.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I believe that a residential development on this site is totally inappropriate and to double the number of houses would of course would be even worse. There are major problems of access and if allowed to proceed would create an isled community with no local jobs in which to sustain the economic vitality of that community. Allowing residential development would be a lost opportunity to create a leisure and tourism area which could be a focus for the regeneration of the upper Rhondda Fawr.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

This proposal fails the procedural test P1 and P2  
It fails on consistency test C1 C2 C3 and C4  
And fails CE2 test with regards Coherence and Effectiveness tests.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>2268.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 920/ASN161 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This site should be retained for Allotment and related activities. There is no great demant for new housing in the upper Rhondda. Mainting allotments would be consistent with council and WAG green agenda. Allotments not only provide exercise they also promote healthy eating which is a major problem in the area. Access to this site could also be problematical

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The above proposals fails on procedural test P2. It also fails Consistency C1, C2, C3 and C4

<b>2268.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
----------------	--	--	--------------------------	---	---	---	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Document:		Site: 1016/ASN163 Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue, Treherbert						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

There is need for more accessible recreational areas in the Treherbert Area. This allocation would be consistent in the strategy to develop tourism in the Upper Rhondda.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

I think this allocation passes the Procedural tests and Consistency tests.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2268.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 855/ASN164 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 I think the proposal for this site is the type of project which should be encouraged in the Upper Rhondda. The education element based on Energy production marries in well with the history of the area and also looks to the future with regards wind farms.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 I think this proposal passes the procedural test P2. And the consistency test C1 C2 C3 and C4

<b>2268.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 978/ASN165 Haigside Allotments, Rhigos Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Allotments have a major contribution to health of the community by given exercise and providing an interest and healthy food to the community. The site should remain for the use of allotment holders and relating activities such as horse riding.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 The passes the procedural test P2 and consistency test C1 C2 C3 and C4

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2268.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 980/ASN166 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
It is very important that the old Treherbert Boys school yard is kept as open space. There paucity of site for informal play in the upper Rhondda I hope this will take into account whilst determining the LDP.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
This proposal satisfies the Comnsistency criteria C1 C2 C3 and C4

<b>2272.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1006/ASN092 Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
This area of land includes the Llantwit Fardre Marsh and the Nant Myddlyn/Afon Clun/Tor-y-Coed Woodland, both of which are RCT SINC  
It is an extensive area of marshy grassland, drier grassland, and wet woodland, encompassing the Nant Dowlais; the Nant Myddlyn and the River Clun. It also includes ancient woodland.  
It provides habitat for a myriad of different species, including Otter; bats, Marsh Fritillary butterflies; small pear-bordered fritillary butterflies and short winged cone head bush crickets.  
Though it serves an agricultural purpose it is nonetheless an important SINC.  
The site also has access and flooding constraints.  
Allocation of this land for residential; retail and office development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
P1, P2, C1, C3, C4, CE2

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2272.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 911/ASN094						Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This area of land includes the Llantwit Fardre Marsh and the Nant Myddlyn/Afon Clun/Tor-y-Coed Woodland, both of which are RCT SINC It is an extensive area of marshy grassland, drier grassland, and wet woodland, encompassing the Nant Dowlais; the Nant Myddlyn and the River Clun. It also includes ancient woodland. It provides habitat for a myriad of different species, including Otter; bats, Marsh Fritillary butterflies; small pear-bordered fritillary butterflies and short winged cone head bush crickets. Though it serves an agricultural purpose it is nonetheless an important SINC. The site also has access and flooding constraints. Allocation of this land for residential; retail and office development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2272.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 910/ASN095 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This area of land includes the Llantwit Fardre Marsh and the Nant Myddlyn/Afon Clun/Tor-y-Coed Woodland, both of which are RCT SINC It is an extensive area of marshy grassland, drier grassland, and wet woodland, encompassing the Nant Dowlais; the Nant Myddlyn and the River Clun. It also includes ancient woodland. It provides habitat for a myriad of different species, including Otter; bats, Marsh Fritillary butterflies; small pear-bordered fritillary butterflies and short winged cone head bush crickets. Though it serves an agricultural purpose it is nonetheless an important SINC. The site also has access and flooding constraints. Allocation of this land for residential; retail and office development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
2272.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 843/ASN018 Land at Gwaun Miskin						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 This area of land is all that is left of the once extensive Gwaun Miskin wetlands, and includes the ancient woodland of the Nant Myddlyn valley.  
 It has an extensive variety of flora and fauna, providing habit for marsh fritillary butterflies; dingy skipper butterflies; bats; dormice and other associated species.  
 It is a green wedge, preventing the coalescence of Beddau and Llantwit Fardre; it is a RCT SINC; it is an area of land covered by Tree Preservation Orders; and it has a public right way.  
 Allocation of this land for residents development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2.

2272.A5			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1001/ASN048 Land at Garth Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 This area of land is part of the Efail Isaf South SINC, and is home to several rare species. These include: the March Fritillary Butterfly; Dormice; significant bat populations; and the Red Kite.  
 Residential development of this area would put undue pressure on the already inadequate road system and will exasperate current drainage problems.  
 Furthermore, the area is poorly serviced by public transport and allocation of this land would see the end to 'village aesthetic'.  
 It is in the countryside, unrelated to existing settlement, and has access issues.  
 Allocation of this land would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2272.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1111/ASS030						Land at Garth Farm			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	This area of land is part of the Efail Isaf South SINC, and is home to several rare species. These include: the March Fritillary Butterfly; Dormice; significant bat populations; and the Red Kite.	
	Residential development of this area would put undue pressure on the already inadequate road system and will exasperate current drainage problems.	
	Furthermore, the area is poorly serviced by public transport and allocation of this land would see the end to 'village aesthetic'.	
	It is in the countryside, unrelated to existing settlement, and has access issues.	
	Allocation of this land would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2272.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 904/ASN049						Land south of Heol Iscoed			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Allocation of this land for residential development would put severe pressure on the already inadequate road facilities in Efail Isaf. Efail Isaf is poorly serviced by public transport, and this development would only exasperate the problem. Allocation of this land would see the end of the 'village ethos and atmosphere' of Efail Isaf. It also encroaches on the Efail Isaf South SINC - an area of land containing among other things, an ancient woodland and habitat for Marsh Fritillary Butterflies. This area of land is in the countryside and unrelated to any village settlement - allocation of this land to residential development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2272.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1097/ASS031						Land south of Heol Iscoed			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Allocation of this land for residential development would put severe pressure on the already inadequate road facilities in Efail Isaf. Efail Isaf is poorly serviced by public transport, and this development would only exasperate the problem. Allocation of this land would see the end of the 'village ethos and atmosphere' of Efail Isaf. It also encroaches on the Efail Isaf South SINC - an area of land containing among other things, an ancient woodland and habitat for Marsh Fritillary Butterflies. This area of land is in the countryside and unrelated to any village settlement - allocation of this land to residential development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2.		

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2272.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 970/ASN050						Land of Heol y Parc			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Not only is this area of land a designated Green Wedge to prevent the coalescence of Efail Isaf and Llantwit Fardre, it is a RCT SINC, and is scheduled to be made into a 'mini nature reserve', once the Church Village Bypass is created. It is also subjected to access constraints. Allocation of this land for residential development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2272.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 961/ASN051 Land adjacent to the Willows and Heol Dowlais										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This area of land is outside the settlement boundary, is unrelated to any existing settlement, and allocation of this land for residential purposes would ultimately lead to a concentrated and separate housing settlement in the countryside.

Allocation of this land for residential development would be against the draft Local Development Plan.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4.

<b>2272.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1056/ASS026 Land adjacent to the Willows and Heol Dowlais										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This area of land is outside the settlement boundary, is unrelated to any existing settlement, and allocation of this land for residential purposes would ultimately lead to a concentrated and separate housing settlement in the countryside.

Allocation of this land for residential development would be against the draft Local Development Plan.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2272.A12</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 916/ASN091 Land at Heol Creigiau						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This area of land is outside the settlement boundary, is unrelated to any existing settlement, and allocation of this land for residential purposes would ultimately lead to a concentrated and separate housing settlement in the countryside.  This area is also designated a flood risk and will also impede on the development of Church Village Bypass Scheme.  It also encroaches on to the Llantwit Fardre Marsh, a RCT SINC.  Allocation of this land to residential development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2, CE4.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2272.A13</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 994/ASN093 Newtown Industrial Estate						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This area of land includes the Llantwit Fardre Marsh SINC, which includes well established woodland - this area of land has already been badly damaged in the past. Given the fact that it is an industrial estate I have concerns about land contamination, especially diesel fuel and asbestos. I also believe that further residential development towards Clariant laboratories is ill-advised (it is one of the few laboratories that has license to mix chemicals on site). I also believe that residential development would put further pressure on the already overused and over polluted A473. This area is also in the countryside and is unrelated to an existing settlement. Allocation of this land for residential development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2272.A14</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1110/ASS051						Edwards Coaches			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This area of land includes the Llantwit Fardre Marsh SINC, which includes well established woodland - this area of land has already been badly damaged in the past. Given the fact that it is an industrial estate I have concerns about land contamination, especially diesel fuel and asbestos. I also believe that further residential development towards Clariant laboratories is ill-advised (it is one of the few laboratories that has license to mix chemicals on site). I also believe that residential development would put further pressure on the already overused and over polluted A473. This area is also in the countryside and is unrelated to an existing settlement. Allocation of this land for residential development would be against the draft RCT Local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2272.A15</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 886/ASN052 Ffrwd Phillip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Allocation of this land for residential development would put severe pressure on the already inadequate road facilities in Efail Isaf, and would lead to the destruction of the `village aesthetic`. It must also be added that Efail Isaf is poorly serviced by public transport, and this are of land has issues with access. This area of land encroaches on to the Efail Isaf South SINC. This are of land is in the countryside and unrelated to village settlement - allocation of this land for residential development would be against the draft RCT local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1,P2,C1,C2, C3,C4.		

<b>2272.A16</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1101/ASS029 Ffrwd Philip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Allocation of this land for residential development would put severe pressure on the already inadequate road facilities in Efail Isaf, and would lead to the destruction of the `village aesthetic`. It must also be added that Efail Isaf is poorly serviced by public transport, and this are of land has issues with access. This area of land encroaches on to the Efail Isaf South SINC. This are of land is in the countryside and unrelated to village settlement - allocation of this land for residential development would be against the draft RCT local Development Plan.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? P1,P2,C1,C2,C3,C4.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2272.A17</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 960/ASN053						Land adjacent to Meadow View, North				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Not only is this area of land a designated Green Wedge to prevent the coalescence of Efail Isaf and Llantwit Fradre, it is a RCT SINC, and id scheduled to be made into a `mini nature reserve`, once the Church Village Bypass is created.  
 It is also subjected to access constraints and is unrelated to an existing settlement.  
 Allocation this land to residential development would be against the draft RCT Local development Plan.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 P1,P2,C1,C2,C3,C4,CE2

<b>2272.A18</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1105/ASS028						Land adjacent to Meadow View, north of Heol Dowlai				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Not only is this area of land a designated Green Wedge to prevent the coalescence of Efail Isaf and Llantwit Fradre, it is a RCT SINC, and id scheduled to be made into a `mini nature reserve`, once the Church Village Bypass is created.  
 It is also subjected to access constraints and is unrelated to an existing settlement.  
 Allocation this land to residential development would be against the draft RCT Local development Plan.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 P1,P2,C1,C2,C3,C4,CE2

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2272.A19</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1109/ASS094						Land at Celyn Farm			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
This area of land contains a Public Right of Way, a stream, and has access constraints.  
Residential development would exasperate localised drainage issues.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

- 2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
P1, P2, CE2

<b>2286.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M		Yes	545	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Document:		Site: 915/ASN047						Land to the rear of 119-130 High Street			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
There are 544 petitions for new houses, please give Trebanog some hope from living in the 1950 with new houses, this will stop people moving away, we want to look after our elderly. We would like to see the 4 sites developed.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

- 2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
Trebanog needs new houses as per other villages. Our Welsh culture is being eroded.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2286.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M		Yes	545	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 945/ASN151						Land fronting Trebanog Road (Rhiw Garn Fawr)				PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

There are 544 petitions for new houses, please give Trebanog some hope from living in the 1950 with new houses, this will stop people moving away, we want to look after our elderly. We would like to see the 4 sites developed.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Trebanog needs new houses as per other villages. Our Welsh culture is being eroded.

<b>2286.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M		Yes	545	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 938/ASN153						Land adjacent to Rhiw Garn (Rhiw Garn Fawr)				PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

There are 544 petitions for new houses, please give Trebanog some hope from living in the 1950 with new houses, this will stop people moving away, we want to look after our elderly. We would like to see the 4 sites developed.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Trebanog needs new houses as per other villages. Our Welsh culture is being eroded.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2286.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M		Yes	545	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Document: Site: 981/ASN155 Land north of Rhiw Garn Fawr PEX Session:  
 Policy: Map: Issue:  
 Summary:

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? There are 544 petitions for new houses, please give Trebanog some hope from living in the 1950 with new houses, this will stop people moving away, we want to look after our elderly. We would like to see the 4 sites developed.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Trebanog needs new houses as per other villages. Our Welsh culture is being eroded.		

<b>2289.A1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	S	M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Document:	Site: 896/ASN070 Land rear of Bute Terrace										PEX Session:			
Policy:	Map:										Issue:			
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I refer to the enclosed plan AS(N) 70 and I also enclose a copy of a plan prepared by RPS as part of the supporting statement to LDP representations which was submitted to you in March 2009. I have marked an area with black hatching in the RPS plan which forms the boundary of the site which was granted outline planning permission under reference 02/1243. This area is to be included within the site boundary of AS(N) 70 and I would be grateful if the site boundary could be amended by including this area.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2291.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M		Yes	150	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road							PEX Session:					
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2291.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M		Yes	150	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2295.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
	I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.		
	SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.		
	By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.		

<b>2301.A1</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 985/ASN034 Land r/o Cilfynydd Road/ Bodwenarth										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?		
	Please note I write on behalf of Cilfynydd and Norton Bridge ward of RCT to object in the strongest terms to the inclusion of the land between Cilfynydd Road and Bodwenarth. As in my previous letters of objection I reiterate the following reasons for our objections the piece of land is without access by the road "no mains services", would increase the already congested single road through Wood Street - Oaklands. It would overburden the outdated 1890s main drainage system, and would cause even greater flooding threat to the area, please understand, Cilfynydd and Norton Bridge cannot sustain any further development and further erosion of what little green space that is left.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2320.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008						SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? No  
I wish to expand on my consultation input at the public enquiry.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
It eradicates inconsistencies and planning conflict.

<b>2325.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 931/ASN125						Werfa Farm				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted as evidence

<b>2336.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1202/ASD038						NSA 9.18 - Site off Cemetery Road, Treorchy				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? No  
I support this site being deleted as a site for residential development, The land should be retained as an open space.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
The site is within 200m of a Recycling centre. Although this is currently closed the Council Leader has pledged to safeguard this site. Page 92 of the LDP also contains this commitment. Therefore it would be inappropriate to build there. In addition the site has been used as an open space for walking and general recreation. It should be retained for this reason. In addition it is actually on the boundary of the settlement area and any building on this site would be to extend the settlement boundary.



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2384.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2384.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2385.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2385.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2385.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1021/ASN162 Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue, Treherbert								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Not long ago, over 100 council houses were demolished on Mount Libanus Council estate in Penyreglyn, Treherbert because they were surplus to requirements. The estate is adjacent to Ynysfeio NSA9.16 site.  In the interim, no further new builds have been erected there because the ward has no need for more new social/affordable homes. Where need has occurred, old stock housing has been upgraded for that purpose. RCT CBC states it has approximately 4000 empty properties, most of these lie in the Upper Rhondda. This acknowledges that there has not, and is not, any need for new builds. The original proposal NSA9.16 allocating 150 such houses adjacent to where almost the same number have been demolished flies in the face of the wards employment and transport infrastructure problems.  The site is an only barely stable coal tip plateau. A far better use would be as recreation and leisure, together with a new relief road from Treorci and just south of new Penyreglyn School via this site to bend on the A4061 Rhigos Road near the Forestry House. There is already precious little available recreation and leisure land within the ward. I support AS(N)163, AS(N)162 and AS(N)167. I support AS(D)37 which seeks the deletion of the residential category for this site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CE2. The original strategy NSA9.16 allowing development of 150 houses on Ynysfeio tip is neither appropriate nor relevant for the wards predicament. Q4 shows that credible evidence for it is absent. Alternatives AS(N)163, AS(N)162, and AS(N)167 will make the LDP a far more robust document.  CE4. the effect of the eventual dualling of the entire length of the A465 Heads of the Valley inter city route should be a catalyst for the development of leisure and tourism in the Upper Rhondda Fawr ward. Recreational land and improved relief road will then be vital. The original NSA9.16 denies the flexibility that should be afforded.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2385.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1016/ASN163						Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue, Treherbert				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>Not long ago, over 100 council houses were demolished on Mount Libanus Council estate in Penyreglyn, Treherbert because they were surplus to requirements. The estate is adjacent to Ynysfeio NSA9.16 site.</p> <p>In the interim, no further new builds have been erected there because the ward has no need for that purpose. RCT CBC states it has approximately 4000 empty properties, most of these lie in the Upper Rhondda. This acknowledges that there has not, and is not, any need for new builds. The original proposal NSA9.16 allocating 150 such houses adjacent to where almost the same number have been demolished flies in the face of the wards employment and transport infrastructure problems.</p> <p>The site is only barely stable regraded coal tip plateau. A far better use would be as a recreation and leisure, together with a new relief road from Treorci and just south of new Penyreglyn School via this site to the bend on the A4061 Rhigos Road near the Forestry House. There is already precious little available recreation ad leisure land within the ward. I support AS(n)163, AS(N)162 and AS(N)167. I support AS(D)37 which seeks the deletion of the residential category for this site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>CE2. The original Strategy NSA9.16 allowing development of 150 houses in Ynysfeio tip is neither appropriate nor relevant for the wards predicament. Q4 shows that credible evidence for this is absent. Alternatives AS(N)163, AS(N)162 and AS(N)167 will make the LDP a far more robust document.</p> <p>CE4. the effect of the eventual dualling of the entire length of the A465 Heads of the Valley inter city route should be a catalyst for the development of leisure and tourism in the Upper Rhondda Fawr ward. Recreational land and improved relief road will than be vital. The original NSA9.16 denies the flexibility that should be afforded.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
2385.A5			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 855/ASN164 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>It remains the case that there is dire need to create sustainable employment opportunities in Upper Rhondda Faur, particularly in Treherbert ward. Such an opportunity exists at the combined sites of former Treherbert Hospital and the adjacent 1.1 acres of former school playing field. Without any strategic vision to help sustain the Community, they were both sold to a private developer by the local Hospital Trust and RCT council respectively. They were grouped in the LDP as one site NSA9.15 but unfortunately have appeared as 2 separate categories and references under the same description in the alternative site register.</p> <p>1.) AS(N)164 employment/energy/educational refers only to the old hospital 2.) AS(N)166 open space/play refers only to the old school playing field</p> <p>The 2008 "Futures of the heads of the valleys" (published by the influential Institute of Welsh Affairs) warns that without creation of long term employment at valley's heads - and the self confidence that will restore, the Communities will slide into non viability by 2030. Leisure and Tourism is the most likely route out of the predicament and every opportunity to realise that vision should be pursued.</p> <p>The sites above, can and should be used to this end, rather than for more residential developments for which there is no proven need and the ever worsening impact they have on our already inadequate transport infrastructures and local employment prospects.</p> <p>The Rhondda's were world famous for their steam coal production in the past. With its new green status at the epicentre of one of the largest wind farms in the UK, where better to have a 'Today Forward' green energy centre aimed at tourists and teaching. Treherbert's hospital site on the A4061 Rhigos Road is the first and nearest location to the wind turbines and but seven brief miles from the A465 Heads of the Valleys link road to the national motorway network. The former hospital site should house the energy centre (alternative use AS(N)164); the former school playground should be used as a picnic/recreation site for visitors to the energy centre as well as for the local population (alternative use AS(N)166). These latter designations would not conflict with the Village Green status currently being sought for the playground.</p>

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>The original LDP allocation of housing for site NSA9.15 is neither realistic nor appropriate for our changing future. AS(N)164 deals with energy/educational use in the former hospital site. AS(N)166 deal with open space/play in the former school playground. Both alternatives offer a far more relevant step forward in creating sustainable employment via the evolving Leisure, Tourism, Educational and Health functions that the ward needs to develop. It will also make the RCT climate change policy more relevant and understandable to both visitors and students.</p> <p>By considering nothing but housing, the original LDP was far too inflexible for a future that will see the potential growth of the Tourism and Leisure industry in the upper Rhondda. Mature landscape sites with magnificent views from the urban periphery and with easy access from the Rhigos road A4061, are in such very short supply that they need to be rescued from the short sited 'residential development' designation now.</p>	

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
2385.A6			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 980/ASN166 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>It remains the case that there is dire need to create sustainable employment opportunities in Upper Rhondda Faur, particularly in Treherbert ward. Such an opportunity exists at the combined sites of former Treherbert Hospital and the adjacent 1.1 acres of former school playing field. Without any strategic vision to help sustain the Community, they were both sold to a private developer by the local Hospital Trust and RCT council respectively. They were grouped in the LDP as one site NSA9.15 but unfortunately have appeared as 2 separate categories and references under the same description in the alternative site register.</p> <p>1.) AS(N)164 employment/energy/educational refers only to the old hospital 2.) AS(N)166 open space/play refers only to the old school playing field</p> <p>The 2008 "Futures of the heads of the valleys" (published by the influential Institute of Welsh Affairs) warns that without creation of long term employment at valley's heads - and the self confidence that will restore, the Communities will slide into non viability by 2030. Leisure and Tourism is the most likely route out of the predicament and every opportunity to realise that vision should be pursued.</p> <p>The sites above, can and should be used to this end, rather than for more residential developments for which there is no proven need and the ever worsening impact they have on our already inadequate transport infrastructures and local employment prospects.</p> <p>The Rhondda's were world famous for their steam coal production in the past. With its new green status at the epicentre of one of the largest wind farms in the UK, where better to have a 'Today Forward' green energy centre aimed at tourists and teaching. Treherbert's hospital site on the A4061 Rhigos Road is the first and nearest location to the wind turbines and but seven brief miles from the A465 Heads of the Valleys link road to the national motorway network. The former hospital site should house the energy centre (alternative use AS(N)164); the former school playground should be used as a picnic/recreation site for visitors to the energy centre as well as for the local population (alternative use AS(N)166). These latter designations would not conflict with the Village Green status currently being sought for the playground.</p>

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>The original LDP allocation of housing for site NSA9.15 is neither realistic nor appropriate for our changing future. AS(N)164 deals with energy/educational use in the former hospital site. AS(N)166 deal with open space/play in the former school playground. Both alternatives offer a far more relevant step forward in creating sustainable employment via the evolving Leisure, Tourism, Educational and Health functions that the ward needs to develop. It will also make the RCT climate change policy more relevant and understandable to both visitors and students.</p> <p>By considering nothing but housing, the original LDP was far too inflexible for a future that will see the potential growth of the Tourism and Leisure industry in the upper Rhondda. Mature landscape sites with magnificent views from the urban periphery and with easy access from the Rhigos road A4061, are in such very short supply that they need to be rescued from the short sited 'residential development' designation now.</p>	



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2385.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 899/ASN167						Land at Pen yr Englyn			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>Not long ago, over 100 council houses were demolished on Mount Libanus Council estate in Penyreglyn, Treherbert because they were surplus to requirements. The estate is adjacent to Ynysfeio NSA9.16 site.</p> <p>In the interim, no further new builds have been erected there because the ward has no need for that purpose. RCT CBC states it has approximately 4000 empty properties, most of these lie in the Upper Rhondda. This acknowledges that there has not, and is not, any need for new builds. The original proposal NSA9.16 allocating 150 such houses adjacent to where almost the same number have been demolished flies in the face of the wards employment and transport infrastructure problems.</p> <p>The site is only barely stable regraded coal tip plateau. A far better use would be as a recreation and leisure, together with a new relief road from Treorci and just south of new Penyreglyn School via this site to the bend on the A4061 Rhigos Road near the Forestry House. There is already precious little available recreation ad leisure land within the ward. I support AS(n)163, AS(N)162 and AS(N)167. I support AS(D)37 which seeks the deletion of the residential category for this site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>CE2. The original Strategy NSA9.16 allowing development of 150 houses in Ynysfeio tip is neither appropriate nor relevant for the wards predicament. Q4 shows that credible evidence for this is absent. Alternatives AS(N)163, AS(N)162 and AS(N)167 will make the LDP a far more robust document.</p> <p>CE4. the effect of the eventual dualling of the entire length of the A465 Heads of the Valley inter city route should be a catalyst for the development of leisure and tourism in the Upper Rhondda Fawr ward. Recreational land and improved relief road will than be vital. The original NSA9.16 denies the flexibility that should be afforded.</p>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2385.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1201/ASD037 NSA 9.16 - Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Not long ago , over 100 council houses were demolished on Mount Libanus Council estate in Penyreglyn, Treherbert because they were surplus to requirements. The estate is adjacent to Ynysfeio NSA9.16 site. In the interim, no further new builds have been erected there because the ward has had no need for more new social/affordable homes. Where need has occurred, old stock housing has been upgraded for that purpose. RCT CBC states it has approximately 4000 empty properties, most of these lie in the Upper Rhondda. This acknowledges that there has not, and is not, any need for new builds. The original proposal NSA9.16 allocating 150 such houses adjacent to where almost the same number have been demolished flies in the face of the wards employment and transport infrastructure problems. The site is an only barley stable regraded coal tip plateau. A far better use would be as recreation and leisure, together with a new relief road from Treorci and just south of new Penyreglyn School via this site to the bend on the A4061 Rhigos Road near the Forestry House. There is already precious little available recreation and leisure land within the ward. I support AS(N)163, AS(N)162 and AS(N)167. I support AS(D)37 which seeks the deletion of the residential category for this site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CE2. The original strategy NSA9.16 allowing development of 150 houses on Ynysfeio tip is neither appropriate nor relevant for the wards predicament. Q4 shows that credible evidence for it is absent. Alternatives AS(N)163, AS(N)162 and AS(N)167 will make the LDP a far more robust document.  CE4. the effect of the eventual dualling of the entire length of the A465 Heads of the Valley inter city route should be a catalyst for the development of leisure and tourism in the Upper Rhondda Fawr ward. Recreational land and improved relief road will then be vital. The original NSA 9.16 denies the flexibility that should be afforded.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2390.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2390.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2393.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2393.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2393.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2393.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2397.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2397.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2400.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2400.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2411.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2413.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2413.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2419.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2419.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2419.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2419.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2420.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2420.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2420.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2420.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2421.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
2421.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2422.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2422.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2422.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2422.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2423.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2423.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2423.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2423.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2439.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2439.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2440.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2440.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2441.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2451.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2451.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2458.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2458.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2460.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2471.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2471.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2481.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2481.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2483.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2483.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2500.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2500.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2986.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2986.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2986.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 906/ASN159 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The Alternative Sites Register was confusing because the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to 2 completely different parcels of land, AS(N) 161 and AS (N)159. To confuse even more, the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to smaller parcels of land within the area called AS (N) 161 e.g. in the LDP Small Sites Register.  To make the situation clear; my original proposal in representation 2986.D1 and 2986 D2 was 1. Create an Energy Centre at the former hospital site for tourists and students 2. use the former school playground as a picnic or recreation site for tourist visitors and students energy experiments activities and demonstrations.  1 and 2 are represented by one site in the LDP.... Site NSA9.15 3 is represented by the map accompanying AS(N)161  I believe it is important that I am called to interview by the Inspector because there is such confusion about boundaries. This is such an important issue for the Upper Rhondda that it must not be jeopardised by default.  I am concerned that 2 pages of carefully composed hand written information for 2986.D2 did not appear on the representation form in the Alternative Sites Register. I want to ensure that they are available to the Inspector, together with the site contour map, OS map, aerial photograph of Treherbert and the flaws in the Sustainability Appraisal for the site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The whole of site NSA9.15 and the Haigside Allotments AS(N)161 can provide Treherbert with employment, boost the local economy by encouraging tourism, as well as contributing to RCT's climate change policy. They can also provide specialist help with science education, vital because there is such a shortage of science teachers in the UK. None of the above can be achieved by placing housing on these sites. Such strategically placed sites are rare and should remain as a public amenity as they were originally designated. The biodiversity of the area can also be retained (see edited Sustainability Appraisal for the site in the submission 2986.D2).		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2986.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:								Site: 855/ASN164 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The Alternative Sites Register was confusing because the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to 2 completely different parcels of land, AS(N)161 and AS(N)159. To confuse even more, the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to smaller parcels of land within the area called AS(N)161 e.g. in the LDP Small Sites Register.  To make the situation clear; my original proposal in representation 2986.D1 and 2986.D2 was 1. create an Energy Centre at the former hospital site for tourists and students. 2. use the former school playground as a picnic or recreation site for tourist visitors and students. 3. use the whole of the Haigside allotment land for car parking, access to the Energy Centre and for energy experiments activities and demonstrations.  1 and 2 are represented by one site in the LDP ..... Site NSA9.15 3 is represented by the map accompanying AS(N)161  I believe it is important that I am called to interview by the Inspector because there is such confusion about boundaries. This is such an important issue for the Upper Rhondda that it must not be jeopardised by default.  I am concerned that 2 pages of carefully composed hand written information for 2986,D2 did not appear on the representation form in the Alternative Sites Register. I want to ensure that they are available to the Inspector, together with the site contour map, OS map, aerial photograph of Treherbert and the flaws in the Sustainability Appraisal for the site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The whole of site NSA9.15 and the Haigside Allotments AS(N)161 can provide Treherbert with employment, boost the local economy by encouraging tourism, as well as contributing to RCT's climate change policy. They can also provide specialist help with science education, vital because there is a shortage of science teachers in the UK. None of the above can be achieved by placing housing on these sites. Such strategically placed sites are rare and should remain as a public amenity as they were originally designated. The biodiversity of the area can also be retained (see edited Sustainability Appraisal for the site in the submission 2986.D2)		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>2986.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 978/ASN165 Haigside Allotments,Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The Alternative Sites Register was confusing because the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to 2 completely different parcels of land, AS(N)161 and AS(N)159. To confuse even more, the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to smaller parcels of land within the area called AS(N)161 e.g. in the LDP Small Sites Register.  To make the situation clear; my original proposal in representation 2986.D1 and 2986.D2 was 1. create an Energy Centre at the former hospital site for tourists and students. 2. use the former school playground as a picnic or recreation site for tourist visitors and students. 3. use the whole of the Haigside allotment land for car parking, access to the Energy Centre and for energy experiments activities and demonstrations.  1 and 2 are represented by one site in the LDP ..... Site NSA9.15 3 is represented by the map accompanying AS(N)161  I believe it is important that I am called to interview by the Inspector because there is such confusion about boundaries. This is such an important issue for the Upper Rhondda that it must not be jeopardised by default.  I am concerned that 2 pages of carefully composed hand written information for 2986,D2 did not appear on the representation form in the Alternative Sites Register. I want to ensure that they are available to the Inspector, together with the site contour map, OS map, aerial photograph of Treherbert and the flaws in the Sustainability Appraisal for the site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The whole of site NSA9.15 and the Haigside Allotments AS(N)161 can provide Treherbert with employment, boost the local economy by encouraging tourism, as well as contributing to RCT's climate change policy. They can also provide specialist help with science education, vital because there is a shortage of science teachers in the UK. None of the above can be achieved by placing housing on these sites. Such strategically placed sites are rare and should remain as a public amenity as they were originally designated. The biodiversity of the area can also be retained (see edited Sustainability Appraisal for the site in the submission 2986.D2)		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2986.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:								Site: 980/ASN166 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The Alternative Sites Register was confusing because the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to 2 completely different parcels of land, AS(N)161 and AS(N)159. To confuse even more, the description 'Land at Rhigos Road' was applied to smaller parcels of land within the area called AS(N)161 e.g. in the LDP Small Sites Register.  To make the situation clear; my original proposal in representation 2986.D1 and 2986.D2 was 1. create an Energy Centre at the former hospital site for tourists and students. 2. use the former school playground as a picnic or recreation site for tourist visitors and students. 3. use the whole of the Haigside allotment land for car parking, access to the Energy Centre and for energy experiments activities and demonstrations.  1 and 2 are represented by one site in the LDP ..... Site NSA9.15 3 is represented by the map accompanying AS(N)161  I believe it is important that I am called to interview by the Inspector because there is such confusion about boundaries. This is such an important issue for the Upper Rhondda that it must not be jeopardised by default.  I am concerned that 2 pages of carefully composed hand written information for 2986,D2 did not appear on the representation form in the Alternative Sites Register. I want to ensure that they are available to the Inspector, together with the site contour map, OS map, aerial photograph of Treherbert and the flaws in the Sustainability Appraisal for the site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The whole of site NSA9.15 and the Haigside Allotments AS(N)161 can provide Treherbert with employment, boost the local economy by encouraging tourism, as well as contributing to RCT's climate change policy. They can also provide specialist help with science education, vital because there is a shortage of science teachers in the UK. None of the above can be achieved by placing housing on these sites. Such strategically placed sites are rare and should remain as a public amenity as they were originally designated. The biodiversity of the area can also be retained (see edited Sustainability Appraisal for the site in the submission 2986.D2)		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2991.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2993.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
Please also see 2993 representation of 99 other peoples view.			
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2995.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>2996.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3019.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3020.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3021.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3022.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3023.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

<b>3024.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3025.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

<b>3026.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3027.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

<b>3028.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3029.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I have spoken with all the residents who signed my previous petition.  I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.  SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.  By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.	No

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.		

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3030.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.  SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.  By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.	No

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3031.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

<b>3032.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3033.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3034.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3036.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
	I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.		
	SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.		
	By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.		

<b>3037.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
	The roads are awful. I now have to think about if I bring my son to see his grandparents.		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	The inconsistency of SSA 10.7 is removed by its addition to the alternative site register.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA Repr	Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3051.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 849/ASN135 Ynysmaerdy to Talbot Green Relief Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

-----  

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

My initial representation outlined my opposition to any link roadway coming through Lanelay as I believe it would destroy a peaceful and unspoilt part of Talbot Green. My farm is green belt land and should not be used for a new roadway to ease traffic congestion. I strongly believe the widening of the existing Tonyrefail to the M4 roadway with perhaps consideration of flyovers at the Talbot Green junction and 'Matalan' roundabout would alleviate any current congestion problems without destroying Lanelay and Ynysmaerdy together with firestry and woodland areas in the Smilog. However, if it is determined a roadway is required from Lanelay to Ynysmaerdy I very strongly oppose the roadway as currently shown which runs parallel to L'oreal's boundary, to the rear of the Fire Service Maintenance units and through my sister's house. I enclose a plan indicating my house, the farm buildings, the farm access, the farm fields and my sister's house. I farm and maintain approximately 25-30 acres of land. I run a small business on the farm where I breed and sell sheep. The electricity supply and water supply which facilitates the farm and farm business is from my house. Not only would the current proposed roadway layout demolish my sister's house, it would demolish all the farm buildings used to house the animals, the farm equipment and machinery; it would cut off the essential electricity and water supply to the farm and my small farm business.

The current roadway layout in Lanelay would destroy Lanelay Farm which I will very strongly oppose. I would also strongly oppose any roadway which would look to cut straight across the green belt farm fields which would effectively split my farm in half and again cause it's viability to end.

If it is a necessity to have a roadway through Lanelay, I attach a map indicating the route I believe it should take which would allow Lanelay Farm to be maintained and continue as it has done for years. I believe destroying a small working farm would be mindless especially as other viable and sensible routes and solutions are available. The route I propose would be the original route shown, however the roadway coming from the roundabout at L'oreal would run almost parallel to the roadway towards Talbot Greeb saving the majority of the rugby field at the front of Lanelay Hall, link up with the existing roadway and head off towards Coed Ely. I believe the existing mountain road should be widened or upgraded only rather than create a complete new roadway cutting across woodland and destroying parts of Ynysmaerdy. I believe this work, hand in hand with widening and flyover works of the existing roadway from Tonyrefail to the M4 would be sensible solution to any congestion problems that currently exist.

-----  

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
----------------------	--------------	------------------------

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

I believe the layout of the current roadway which cuts my farm house off from my farm, runs straight through the main and only access onto my farm, which runs through my farm buildings esential for maintaining and farming 25 to 30 acres of green belt farm land, viable location for the Lanelay to Ynysmaerdy Roadway.

As above, I believe the existing mountain road should be widened or upgraded only rather than create a complete new roadway cutting across woodland and destroying parts of Ynysmaerdy. I believe this work, hand in hand with widening and flyover works of the existing roadway from Tonyrefail to the M4 would be sensible solution to any congestion problems that currently exist.

If a roadway is required through Lanelay, I believe it should take the original proposed 'option' route as per the 'Local Plan' which I believe has been in place and in the public domain, for a number of years. It is far more sensible and feasible to use and upgrade as much of the existing mountain roadway footprint as possible taking all necessary measures to minimise the impact and protect what has been established in Lanelay, in particular the working farm, for years, and to utilise, where possible the old railway track between Lanelay and Coed Ely.

I believe the current roadway layout plan does not take into account P1, P2, C1, C2, C3, C4, CE1, CE2.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3052.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 986/ASN141 Land South of Gilfach Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 To change the area from employment to residential would be detrimental to the infrastructure of the area as more jobs are needed.  
 More houses in this area would put extra strain on all local services, doctors, schools etc.

<b>3052.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 972/ASN142 SSA 10.10 - Land east of Hafod Wen and north of Co						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It will distroy natural wildlife habitate

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3052.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 863/ASN143 St. Johns The Baptist's Church										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object to the site being used for housing as the access is unsuitable, and the amount of traffic is already excessive.  
 Problems already exist with the drainage and surface water in the area.  
 There is already a high density of housing proposed for the area.  
 There is a strain on local services, schools and emergency services.  
 There is a protected species of slowworm and bats in the area.  
 We believe a graveyard is totally unsuitable for housing.

<b>3052.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 934/ASN144 SSA 10.2 - Trane Farm										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3052.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 991/ASN145 Land at Trane Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate

<b>3052.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1017/ASN146 Land at Tylcha Fach						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate

<b>3052.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 969/ASN147 Land off Mill Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3052.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 864/ASN149 Land rear of Mill Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate

<b>3052.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1071/ASS072 Land at Tylcha Fach						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate.

<b>3052.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1116/ASS073 Land to the North of Station Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3052.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1073/ASS074						Land off Mill Street			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate.

<b>3052.A12</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1060/ASS077						Land rear of Tylcha Wen Terrace			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate.

<b>3052.A13</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1070/ASS078						Land at Tylcha Fach, Tonyrefail			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would distroy natural wildlife habitate.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3052.A14</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1069/ASS079						Land rear of 53 The Avenue				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 We object because it will cause an increase in traffic causing more pollution.  
 It will put extra pressure on the infrastructure of the area, the emergency services, doctors, schools etc.  
 It would destroy natural wildlife habitate.

<b>3052.A15</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1115/ASS080						Land to the rear of 8 - 54 Llantrisant Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 The loss of allotments which are important for leisure and environment.  
 Unsuitable access, already to much traffic in the area.  
 There are already problems with sewerage and surface water drainage.  
 There is a strain on local services, schools and emergency services.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3052.A16</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Document: Site: 1046/ASS089 Land off Cyncoed PEX Session:  
 Policy: Map: Issue:  
 Summary:

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Please see attached Self Assessment form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>3058.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 953/ASN011 Cwm Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l	SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
1	3 - 4			Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?											
<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposal to include the site at Cwm Farm, Aberdare in the Settlement Area for Residential purposes. The proposal is for properties of a high density (possibly 200 plus dwellings) to be built on agricultural land which is currently identified as part of a green field site. If included in the Settlement Area for housing it would be in conflict with the policies of the Council in recognising green field sites as well as being an intrusion into the Countryside and a contradiction of the Council's proactive and highly successful approach to recreational/tourism activities in the area.</p> <p>The land in question adjoins the Dare Valley Country Park, a venue which has recently been further developed by the local authority at some great expense and is proudly attracting visitors from many areas, both locally and nationally. Residential development at Cwm Farm would be obtrusive, would detract from the enjoyment of the Country Park and would be a major intrusion on the environment and the scenic views enjoyed by its many users.</p> <p>Views, Vistas - On the site itself there are a large number of mature trees and plans and with its natural growth this is a sanctuary for many species of birds, invertebrates and other forms of wildlife. I am not aware if an investigation has been carried out to identify all the species using the land as their natural habitat but I assume that this would have been done prior to it being recommended for inclusion in the settlement area.</p> <p>Access to Site - I have already been sent a proposed access plan to this site as suggested by the developers. This identifies the one access point as being within the Country Park itself with a roadway 5.5 metres wide traversing the Park for approximately 1/2 - 3/4 miles leading to the busy A4233 Aberdare/Maerdy Mountain Road accessing at Graig Place (currently a No Through Road with no access onto Graig Place). Difficulties/dangers are already experienced on the A4233 at this point which has a very steep gradient exacerbated by the very busy traffic flow which includes many large lorries and the speed that these vehicles travel through the area. This danger has been recognised by the Police and Highway Authority and an "electronic speed censor" warning sign has been recently installed at this very same point of access. The A4233 is also the route of a regular bus service to the Rhondda and Porthcawl and is already limited to a single file because residents' vehicles are parked outside the majority of properties in Graig Place, Graig Isaf and Monk Street.</p> <p>The route leading to the Country Park as proposed by the developers is used by many walkers, including those walking their dogs, cyclists and horse riders and is also used as a natural play area for the numerous children in the area including those attending the local school. As evidence that the developers have already recognised road safety dangers by implementing access through this route they have proposed installing a number of speed cushions along the whole length of the route and are also suggesting a shared 3 metre footway/cycleway as part of the roadway along the whole route. This, I would suggest, will in no way meet the requirements of the users or ensure their safety and would severely restrict the freedom of movement in this part of the Country Park (e.g. children will not be able to roam free dogs will need to be on leads etc).</p> <p>From at present a very few vehicles using this access route to the Country Park daily should the development, including current access proposals proceed, a busy "highway" with its resultant problems will materialise which is in total conflict with the original intention of establishing a Country Park within the community. It should also be noted that no provision is in place for street lighting along this route - this is currently unnecessary as it is a Country Park.</p> <p>Social/Demographic Issues - There are currently no shops or other facilities in the vicinity of the proposed development other than the Country Park and its Visitors Centre, so any development resulting in an increase in the local population would require all new residents, including those travelling to work and to schools, to travel to Aberdare Town Centre via the same route adding to traffic congestion and related dangers as referred to above.</p> <p>I understand that a previous application to develop a "single" property on Cwm Farm was refused. There would, therefore, appear to be no apparent reason not to follow this precedent of refusal for what is now a proposal for major residential development. As previously stated it is totally incomprehensible that, having undertaken the recent major developments at the Country Park and having expended such large amounts of money in achieving these improvements and its highly successful public relations exercise in attracting more visitors, the commendable foresight and achievement of the local authority could be jeopardised by permitting a development of the kind proposed which is so out of keeping with the natural environment of the Country Park.</p> <p>I would therefore respectfully request that Cwm Farm is not included in the Settlement Area for Residential purposes and I would be pleased to discuss with the Inspector any of the points I have raised.</p>															

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	
<p>I consider that the inclusion of this site in the Settlement Area for Residential purposes would be in conflict with the Council's policies in recognising green field sites and does not have regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or adjoining areas, i.e. the Dare Valley Country Park. It also contradicts the Council's proactive and highly successful approach to recreation and tourism in the area as set out in its Community Plan and other policy documents.</p>			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3061.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:										Issue:		
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The roads now are horrendous and greenfields lost.	No

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? There was an inconsistency which deletion now removes.		

<b>3064.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:										Issue:		
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Basically, all as previously stated in my representation on the Draft Document. The road is dangerous and is at odds with previous assesments.	No

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Its deletion is consistent with previous assessments in 2008.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3066.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

<b>3067.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3068.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3070.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3073.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3075.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3077.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3079.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3080.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 849/ASN135 Ynysmaerdy to Talbot Green Relief Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The route of this RCT new/proposed Talbot Green relief road is ill thought out, especially at the northern end, and the proposal below should be given very serious consideration to supercede it (assuming that it is established that such a relief road is actually necessary in the first place). A far superior alternative would be to upgrade the existing 'forestry' road, which already links the area near the roundabout in front of the L'oreal factory (Lanelay) to the "Coedely" roundabout (on the A4119 road to the Rhondda). This option would also be much safer than the RCT proposal regarding where/how the relief road joins the A4119 road at the northern end (as future relief road traffic entering/leaving the RCT proposed "junction" will present a higher degree of risk and will cause chaos at the Ynysmaerdy roundabout during peak traffic hours).

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Ref: Coherence and Effectiveness Tests below  
 First part of CE1 applies  
 All of CE2 applies  
 Probably CE4 will apply.

3089.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1067/ASS091 Playing Field at Cwmbach Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

It is using up part of what is now a pleasant gerent buffer zone between communities in Abernant/Plasdraw and Cwmbach. This area is constantly changing with its rich variety of flora such as wild orchids and fauna including owls, nuthatches, treecreepers, woodpeckers and many other birds including spring and summer visiting birds. A number of small mammals are also found in this area.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Please refer to Q4

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3123.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M		Yes	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1200/ASD036 NSA 9.5 - Tegfan Farm, Potters Field								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No
1. Access as proposed as per original LDP Allocation NSA 9.5 not suitable through residential site with inadequate width roads therefore remove proposal.	
2. Other uses such as extension or cemetery should be considered.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
C1 - Future cemetery requirements considerations.		
CE2 - Traffic Throughput on inadequate roads.		

<b>3125.A1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	S	M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Document:		Site: 998/ASN061 Land at 43-60 Incline Row								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
We support the application above provided that a previous application for permission to build on No.s 18,21,24,,39, Incline Row are to be included in the deposit draft plan. We have been refused on the grounds of building on a Greenfield site and access to the plots. The same access would be used for 43 -60 Incline Row site No. AS (N) 61. The plots are actually a Brownfield site as there were 60 houses demolished in 1958-59.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
C1,C2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3126.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 970/ASN050 Land of Heol y Parc						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site is subjected to access constraints. These are further exacerbated by the imminent construction of the adjacent roundabouts for the Church Village Bypass.  This site is a designated SINC  Would entail further loss of another green wedge from the village.  Site is a development outside the village boundary.  Destruction of mauve trees which at present will provide a buffer and sound barrier from the new by pass.  Proposed development undermines ecological and environmental designations of site.  Does not have regard to National Policy.	

<b>3165.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 909/ASN179 Land off Ystrad Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Would you please note that on Alternative Site Register plan for the above land the boundaries are not as the previous planning application boundaries. Please find enclosed a copy of the application plan with the correct Alternative Site boundaries edged in both red and blue.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3170.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 849/ASN135 Ynysmaerdy to Talbot Green Relief Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We fully support the new route shown on the grid reference E303112, N 182770. We believe that if it is truly necessary to provide a new relief road then this is a better route than previously proposed.	
1.	It will not be necessary to demolish any of the five houses that were affected by the previous route.	
2.	The new route could not easily go to the north of Lanelay Farm in a 'curve' avoiding compulsory purchase of that property.	
3.	The new route will be alongside light industrial premises - thus noise pollution to properties in Forest Hills will be minimised - not the case with your original route.	
4.	Disturbance to wildlife - removal of trees and habitat alongside the river will not be necessary with this new route.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? If it is truly necessary to build this new relief road then it would make most sense to minimise the costs of building the road. Compulsory purchase of at least 5 new properties is not sensible if there is a viable alternative.		

<b>3187.A1</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 970/ASN050 Land of Heol y Parc										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Loss of wildlife Loss of Trees Loss of Greenfield Not in line with Planning Policy Wales Roads will not take traffic	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? As Q4		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3209.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M		Yes	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1200/ASD036						NSA 9.5 - Tegfan Farm, Potters Field				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No
The removal of As (D) 36 from the LDP is a sound decision (SIC) ,based on access restrictions that would arise if AS (D) 36 had not been deleted from the plan.		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
It would make life, due to Health and Safety considerations, better for the residents of Potters Field			



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3227.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3227.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3227.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3227.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3236.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The proposal to extend the Blaenrhondda settlement boundary to the west should be resisted because it encroaches on the SSA F boundary identified in Tan 8. The SSA F should be safeguarded from uses and proposals which conflict with the identified national need to use the land within SSA F for wind farms.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? C1 C2		

<b>3236.A2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	M				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026						Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)				PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The proposal to revise the outline plan and to increase the number of dwellings at the former Fernhill Colliery Site, Blaenrhondda from 400 to 800 dwellings should be resisted because TAN 8 recommends local planning authorities be aware that developments could sterilise land for wind power proposals and bear his in mind during policy formulation and decision making (paragraph 2.10).	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? C1 C2		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3236.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 957/ASN071	Tower Colliery Pit Head Site					PEX Session:	
Policy:							Map:		Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 The development may create a new public viewpoint from which the impact of turbines in the SSA F will be judged. This may restrict the opportunity to fully develop SSA F as anticipated in TAN 8.  
 The proposed development could also conflict with the gird connection of the wind farm proposed for SSA F.  
 If the representation is to be included in the plan as requested by the representation then the proposed constraints must include acknowledgement of SSA F as set out in TAN 8 and the need to safeguard of SSA F for wind farm development.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 C1, C2

<b>3236.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 959/ASN074	Land between A465 and Treherbert Road					PEX Session:	
Policy:							Map:		Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 The proposal to extend the Hirwaun settlement boundary to the south should be resisted because it encroaches on the SAS F boundary identified in TAN8. The SSA F should be safeguarded from uses and proposal which conflict with the identified national need to use the land within SSA F for wind farms.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 C1, C2

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3236.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 865/ASN102 Mountain Ash General Hospital						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The proposal to extend the Mountain Ash settlement boundary to the north should be resisted because it encroaches on the SSA F boundary identified in TAN 8. The SSA F should be safeguarded from uses and proposals which conflict with the identified national need to use the land within SSA F for wind farms.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1, C2

<b>3236.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1096/ASS016 Land at Fernhill House						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The proposal to extend the Blaenrhondda settlement boundary to the west should be resisted because it encroaches on the SSA F boundary identified in TAN 8. The SSA F should be safeguarded from uses and proposals which conflict with the identified national need to use the land within SSA F for wind farms.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1, C2.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3236.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1041/ASS044 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The proposal to extend the Hirwaun Settlement Boundary to the south should be resisted because it encroaches on the SSA F boundary identified in TAN 8. The SSA F should be safeguarded from uses and proposals which conflict with the identified national need to use the land within SSA F for wind farms.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1, C2

<b>3236.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1090/ASS047 Land South of Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The proposal to include a new policy for inclusion of land west of Mount Pleasant Inn and land between the A465 and Treherbert Road as open space providing for recreation and ecological enhancement and the proposal to increase the development envisaged by NSA 8 should be resisted because it encroaches on the SSA F boundary identified in TAN 8.

The SSA F should be safeguarded from uses and proposals which conflict with the identified national need to use the land within SSA F for wind farms.

If the representation is to be included in the development plan as requested by the representation then the proposed constraints must include acknowledgement and safeguarding of SSA F in TAN 8.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1, C2



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3243.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 897/ASN055	Land South of the Ferns					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
SA/SEA and supporting information received

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.

<b>3243.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 888/ASN057	Land East of the Ferns					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
SA/SEA and supporting information received

<b>3248.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 973/ASN113	Ceulan Stud, Pontyclun					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
The site AS(N)113 is not the site submitted in March 2009 on Candidate Site register, site number 174.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
Previously site R5 of the Llantrisant Interim Local Plan. Infill area between Miskin, Pontyclun and the M4 motorway, surrounded on all sides by residential developments including Mill Race built on a flood plain.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3254.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 852/ASN028 Golf Course Site, Brynna Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?												
Sustainability Appraisal submitted in support.														

<b>3254.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 862/ASN029 Land South of Brynna Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?												
Sustainability Appraisal submitted in support.														

<b>3254.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 878/ASN082 Land at the cricket field										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?												
Please find enclosed representations to the consultation on alternative sites in the Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan (LDP) in the form of a Sustainability Appraisal for Land to the south of the Recreation Field, Llanharan (Candidate Site No. 398).														
You will be aware of our previous representation in relation to the Deposit Draft LDP and development within Key Settlement of Llanharan therefore these have not been repeated in detail here.														
However, it is considered that RCT's current approach with respect to development within this key settlement is flawed, in particular the deliverability of the Llanilid site within the Plan period. As such it is considered that the LDP is unsound.														
The above site provides a sustainable form of development that is consistent with Sustainability Objectives of the LDP and this is demonstrated by the enclosed Sustainability Appraisal, which has been assessed using the Council's own methodology, with minor variations where that methodology is considered to be flawed.														
I trust that the enclosed is acceptable but please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information in clarification.														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3255.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 902/ASN083						Land to the north of The Patch			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? My representations have been set-out in detail on the attached documents and plans, which include:  1. Table 1 - Comparison of Stage 1 Assessment by RCT with my own Stage 1 Assessment of proposed Alternative Site No. 83 for residential development on land to the north of The Patch - Llanharry. 2. Table 2 - Comparison of Stage 2 Assessment by RCT with my own Stage 2 Assessment of proposed Alternative Site No. 83 for residential development on land to the north of The Patch Llanharry. 3. Table 3 - Comparison of Stage 1 Assessment by RCT with my own Stage 3 Assessment of proposed Candidate Site No 115 for residential development on land to the west of Llechau - Llanharry. 4. Table 4 - Comparison of Stage 2 Assessment by RCT with my own Stage Assessment of proposed Candidate Site No. 115 for residential development on land to the west of Llechau. - Llanharry. 5. Statement of support for proposed Alternative Site No. 83 for residential development and critical appraisal of Candidate Site No. 115 of the Rhondda-Cynon-Taf Local Development Plan (SOS) and accompanying Appendices 1-8 inclusive. 6. Plan GD/04 - Proposed residential development on land to the north of the Patch - Llanharry. 7. Plan GD/05 - Planning/Environmental/Ownership constraints to the development of Candidate Site No. 115 for residential development on land to the west of Llechau - Llanharry. 8. FIG 3 - BSC (Extract taken from the Llanharry Mine Final Subsidence Report, dated 19/06/84) 9. Plan GD/07 - Landscape Assessment. 10. Plan GD/08 - Landscape Assessment. 11. Plan GD/09 - Landscape Assessment. 12. Plan GD/10 - Landscape Assessment.  13. Distance to local amenities from proposed Alternative Site No. 83	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
------	----------	-------	-----------------

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2 5				Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The inclusion of Candidate Site No. 115 and the exclusion of Alternative Site No. 83 mean that the present version of the LDP is unsound in this respect because:</p> <p>C1 (Consistency Tests) - It pays insufficient regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the Llanharry area.</p> <p>C2 (Consistency Tests) - It pays insufficient regard to National Policy.</p> <p>CE2 (Coherence &amp; Effectiveness Tests) - The residential allocation in Policy SSA 10 are not realistic and appropriate having considered the relevant alternatives and are not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.</p> <p>See also the attached Statement of support for proposed Alternative Site No. 83 for residential development and critical appraisal of Candidate Site No. 115 of the Rhondda-Cynon-Taf Local Development Plan (SOS) and accompanying Appendices 1-8 inclusive.</p>														

<b>3260.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:								Site: 889/ASN072	Land opposite Gamlyn Terrace				PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Please see attached Self Assessment Form for the site which relates its development to SA SEA objectives.

<i>Item Question</i>									<i>Reply</i>					<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2 5				Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.</p>														

<b>3265.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:								Site: 996/ASN122	Land at Mount Pleasant				PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Please see attached Self Assessment Form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.

<i>Item Question</i>									<i>Reply</i>					<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2 5				Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The inclusion of the site would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.</p>														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3267.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 997/ASN031 Llwynau Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Please see attached Self Assessment form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness test CE2 and CE4.

<b>3271.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1043/ASS064 Land at Troedrhiv-Trwyn						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:				Issue:									
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Please see attached Self Assessment form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
The inclusion of this site would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3279.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>			M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 882/ASN140 Land at Parc Eirin								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

-----  

Item	Question	Representation Text
------	----------	---------------------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Local Development Plan 2006-2021 - Comments on Alternative Sites Register, Land at Parc Eirin, Tonyrefail.

Further to the submitted representation on behalf of our client Grand Scenic, in relation to the Deposit Plan, we wish to provide you with an update on the position with the site in terms of the consultation process regarding the Alternative Sites Register. The content of this letter needs to be considered alongside the representations that we submitted to the Deposit Plan.

For your information the details for the site in the Alternative Site Register are as follows:

Alternative site number - AS(S)76

Site - Land at Parc Eirin

Proposed Alternative Use - Include within residential settlement boundary

Settlement - Tonyrefail

Alternative site number - AS(N)140

Site - Land at Parc Eirin

Proposed Alternative Use - Employment

Settlement - Tonyrefail

As outlined within the representation submitted to the Deposit Plan, in January 2008 a planning application (ref: 07/1334/10) for 'Engineering operation to provide development plateaux and associated footpath/cycle path and new highway access' was recommended for approval by the Taff Ely Development Control Committee, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement.

Accordingly I can now advise the S106 agreement has been completed and planning permission was issued on 08th July 2009. A copy of the decision notice is included for your information.

Accordingly an extant planning permission is now in place which will allow alterations to the original profiling of the site to primarily prepare the site for potential future employment generation uses. The permission will allow the following:

- Re-profiling of the site (amendments to previous works)
- Incorporation of a permanent route for a long distance shared use path
- New highway access connecting to the existing highway arrangements at Parc Eirin

As outlined within our earlier representations, the re-profiling of the site will ensure that the site is 'ready to go' for an employment use. This will present a viable development opportunity should an inward investor(s) become interested in the potential opportunities for employment generation that may exist.

In addition to the above representations which have been listed in the Alternative Sites Register, we objected to the allocation of the site on the proposals map as a Special Landscape Area (SLA) under Policy SSA 23.7. This is firstly due to the character of the site within settlement limits, this will necessitate the revision to the SLA which is sought, in any event.

Accordingly the issuing of planning permission is a significant material consideration in favour of the representations that we have duly made to the emerging plan.

I hope and trust the enclosed information will assist you with the progression of the LDP. If we can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3279.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>			M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1094/ASS076						Land at Parc Eirin			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

-----  

Item	Question	Representation Text
------	----------	---------------------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

The Local Development Plan 2006-2021 - Comments on Alternative Sites Register, Land at Parc Eirin, Tonyrefail.

Further to the submitted representation on behalf of our client Grand Scenic, in relation to the Deposit Plan, we wish to provide you with an update on the position with the site in terms of the consultation process regarding the Alternative Sites Register. The content of this letter needs to be considered alongside the representations that we submitted to the Deposit Plan.

For your information the details for the site in the Alternative Site Register are as follows:

Alternative site number - AS(S)76

Site - Land at Parc Eirin

Proposed Alternative Use - Include within residential settlement boundary

Settlement - Tonyrefail

Alternative site number - AS(N)140

Site - Land at Parc Eirin

Proposed Alternative Use - Employment

Settlement - Tonyrefail

As outlined within the representation submitted to the Deposit Plan, in January 2008 a planning application (ref: 07/1334/10) for 'Engineering operation to provide development plateaux and associated footpath/cycle path and new highway access' was recommended for approval by the Taff Ely Development Control Committee, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement.

Accordingly I can now advise the S106 agreement has been completed and planning permission was issued on 08th July 2009. A copy of the decision notice is included for your information.

Accordingly an extant planning permission is now in place which will allow alterations to the original profiling of the site to primarily prepare the site for potential future employment generation uses. The permission will allow the following:

- Re-profiling of the site (amendments to previous works)
- Incorporation of a permanent route for a long distance shared use path
- New highway access connecting to the existing highway arrangements at Parc Eirin

As outlined within our earlier representations, the re-profiling of the site will ensure that the site is 'ready to go' for an employment use. This will present a viable development opportunity should an inward investor(s) become interested in the potential opportunities for employment generation that may exist.

In addition to the above representations which have been listed in the Alternative Sites Register, we objected to the allocation of the site on the proposals map as a Special Landscape Area (SLA) under Policy SSA 23.7. This is firstly due to the character of the site within settlement limits, this will necessitate the revision to the SLA which is sought, in any event.

Accordingly the issuing of planning permission is a significant material consideration in favour of the representations that we have duly made to the emerging plan.

I hope and trust the enclosed information will assist you with the progression of the LDP. If we can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3282.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 891/ASN010 Land at Coleg Morgannwg						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Assessment Scoping Report submitted in support.

<b>3282.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1031/ASS006 Coleg Morgannwg						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 5034 - Coleg Morgannwg - Aberdare College

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3289.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 880/ASN027 Former Stelco Hardy Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Objection is made to the proposed allocation of the Stelco Hardy site for employment purposes.

Whilst this site was formerly used for employment purposes, it has been vacant and marketed since 2005 and there has been no interest in its purchase for employment use.

There is more than adequate land allocated to meet employment needs under the provisions of policy NSA 14, including at the Cae Mawr Industrial Estate at Treorchy, where there is a 3.6 hectare site which forms part of an existing industrial estate.

The use of this site for housing would contribute to providing a wider range and choice of housing site and could contribute to meeting the locality's and borough's housing needs in the shorter term. Concern is expressed that some of the larger brownfield sites allocated in the Deposit Plan will require land reclamation and / or major infrastructure requirements and that their implementation is unlikely or will be considerably delayed.

The development of this site for housing would be compatible with surrounding residential uses and would not produce any land use conflict.

A Flood consequence Assessment prepared for this site, in support of a planning application for housing, successfully demonstrated that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed in accordance with criteria set out in TAN 15 and there was no objection from the Environment Agency. The site has been subject to detailed site investigation and ground contamination can be remediated to provide a suitable and viable site for housing.

It is considered that the site is suitable to accommodate residential development and should be allocated for this purpose under the provisions of NSA 9.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

It is submitted that the site should be allocated for residential Development under the provisions of policy NSA 9 of the Deposit Plan. The proposed allocation is realistic and appropriate and its allocation would help secure a robust LDP policy base thus meeting the requirements of Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE2.

The allocation of the site would also be compatible with the provisions of National Policy set out in the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006, which seeks to secure an adequate housing land supply in locations people want to live and consequently the proposal would also meet the requirements of Consistency Test C2.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3289.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1019/ASN025						Former Stelco Hardy Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Objection is made to the proposed allocation of the Stelco Hardy site for community purposes.  This site was formerly used for employment purposes but has been vacant and marketed since 2005 and there has been no interest in its purchase for community use.  The site is in private ownership and its development for community uses is not viable. The objectors give no indication of finance being available for the acquisition and implementation of the proposal. However, the development of this site for residential use would allow for its remediation as well as for the provision of community uses as part of the proposal. It would also allow for the site to be brought into beneficial use. Part of the site would be retained for open space in accordance with the normal standards.  The use of this site for housing would contribute to providing a wider range and choice of housing site and could contribute to meeting the locality's and borough housing needs in the shorter term. Concern is expressed that some of the larger brownfield sites allocated in the Deposit Plan will require land reclamation and/or major infrastructure requirements and that their implementation is unlikely or will be considerably delayed.  The development of this site for housing would be compatible with surrounding residential uses and would not produce any land use conflict.  It is claimed that the site is constrained as it falls within Zone C2 Flood Plain and that it is contaminated, The Flood Consequences Assessment in support of the planning application for housing successfully demonstrated that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed in accordance with criteria set out in TAN 15 and there was no objection from the Environment Agency. The site has been subject to detailed site investigation and ground contamination can be remediated to provide suitable and viable site for housing.  It is considered that the site is suitable to accommodate residential development and should be allocated for this purpose under the provisions of NSA9.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It is submitted that the site should be allocated for residential development under the provisions of policy NSA 9 of the Deposit Plan. The proposed allocation is realistic and appropriate and its allocation would help secure a robust LDP policy base thus meeting the requirements of Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE2.  The allocation of the site would also be compatible with the provisions of National Policy set out in the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006, which seeks to secure an adequate housing land supply in locations people want to live and consequently the proposal would also meet the requirements of Consistency C2.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3289.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 919/ASN160 Former Stelco Hardy Factory										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Additional information received SA/SEA and Habitat Assessment:

<b>3290.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 860/ASN056 Land to the rear of High Street										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Additional information SA/SEA.

<b>3290.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1120/ASS035 Land to the rear of High Street										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Sustainability Appraisal submitted - Site 3099 -  
- R/O High Street, Giffach Goch.

<b>3291.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 988/ASN014 Land at Cwmbach Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Habitat Assessment Scoping Report Submitted as Evidence

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3291.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1118/ASS009 Land at Cwmbach Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Sustainability Appraisal submitted. Site 4410 - - Cwmbach Road, Aberdare.	

<b>3295.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 971/ASN112 Land at Leekes / Royal Mail						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:		Issue:										
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Representations D1 - D3.  We object to the proposed extension to the Mwyndy/Talbot Green strategic site to include the Royal Mail delivery office site as, by their own admission at paragraph 4.1 o the supporting statement prepared by Atisreal, the Royal Mail have no current plans to close operations or redevelop the site in question. This, combined with the very small size of the Royal Mail site results in the extension of the Mwyndy/Talbot Green strategic site to include this land as unsound because: (a) it would result in part of a strategic site allocation being undeliverable at least in the short to medium term and (b) even if it were deliverable, it would make no tangible difference to the allocation of the strategic site as set out in the Deposit Plan and (c) the allocation of the Royal Mail site for valuable land uses at the expense of the existing strategic allocation would only serve to reduce the economic viability and bringing forward the allocation as a whole.  Whilst paragraph 4.2 of Atisreal supporting statement claims that failure to allocate the Royal Mail site would effectively result in it being sterilised, we do not consider this to be the case. If, in the long term, the Royal Mail site were to becme surplus to operational requirements it would be considered as an edge of town centre site where a host of redevelopment options would apply. Accordingly, far from sterilising the land, the allocation set out in the Deposit Plan would only serve to increase the redevelopment potential of this land holding.		

2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It would allow the relevant policy/allocation to remain as set out in the Despoit Plan which, subject to the representation we made at the Deposit Plan stage, would meet the relevant tests of soundness.		
-----	---	--	--

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3295.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 854/ASN114 Land at Crabtree and Evelyn						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Representations D1 and D2.	
<p>We object to the proposed extension of the Mwyndy/Talbot Green strategic site to include the Crabtree and Evelyn site and other land to the north. One of the significant strengths of the SSA8 strategic site is that a vast majority of the lad allocated is within the control of a single developer (Valad Developments (Llantrisant) Ltd) who have substantial cash reserves and significant development experience thus rendering the strategic allocation as highly deliverable. The extension of the strategic site to include the land referred to in the Crabtree and Evelyn and associated land for aluable uses would reduce the ability to fund essential infrastructure and service improvements.</p> <p>It should also be noted that approximately half of the Crabtree and Evelyn site is severely affected by flooding as clarified on page 5-48 of the strategic Flood Consequences Assessment prepared on behalf of the Council by Scott Wilson in October 2008. Given that the Crabtree and Evelyn representations confirm that their site is just 2.45 ha in size it seems likely that the claim made by Crabtree and Evelyn that allocation of their site would make significant savings on green field allocations elsewhere as part of strategic allocation SSA8. In any event the Indicative Concept Plan that formed a part of the Deposit Local Development Plan demonstrates that much of the town centre allocation is already on brownfield land. It is the housing allocation in the Mwyndy area that occupies Greenfield land and, in this regard, it is the topography and existing field boundaries that set the extent of that housing allocation. Accordingly, it is unlikely that the allocation of the Crabtree and Evelyn land would result in any meaningful reduction of Greenfield allocation.</p>		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
<p>It would allow the relevant policy/allocation to remain as set out in the Deposit Plan which, subject to the representation we made at the Deposit Plan stage, would meet the relevant tests of soundness.</p>			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3295.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1190/ASD026						SSA 8 - Mwyndy / Talbot Green			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Representation D34 and D87	
<p>We object to CCW's comments on Policy SSA8 as we do not consider that the proposal will result in the coalescence of a number of small settlements nor will it have an unacceptable impact upon the landscape and character of the local area. We refer to the attached Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in this regard.</p> <p>Furthermore, our client is very aware of the biodiversity interests of this site and, indeed, has submitted significant supporting information in this regard.</p> <p>Representation D40</p> <p>We object to the comments made in relation to criteria 8 of Policy AW2 which, if simply added to existing wording of criteria 8 could preclude development within, near or adjacent to green wedges, special landscape areas and internationally, nationally or locally designated conservation sites. We consider this to be far too restrictive and refer to our representation at the Deposit Plan stage in respect of Policy AW2.</p> <p>Representations D86, D90 and D98</p> <p>We object to the representations seeking to make compliance with Policies SSA1, SSA6 and SSA13 dependent upon compliance with other relevant LDP Policies. We consider this is bad practice as, if a proposed development does not comply with other relevant LDP Policies, that non-compliance will be taken into account in his own right as part of the development control determination.</p>		

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
<p>It would allow the relevant policy/allocation to remain as set out in the Deposit Plan which, subject to the representation we made at the Deposit Stage, would meet the relevant tests of soundness.</p>			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3295.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1190/ASD026 SSA 8 - Mwyndy / Talbot Green						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?													
<p>Comments on behalf of Valad Developments (Llantrisant) Ltd in relation to Tesco (Representor 2049) - Alternative site ref: AS (D) 26 Q.4 continuation sheet...</p> <p>Representation D6</p> <p>We object to the Tesco comments in respect of retail floorspace quantum and in this regard refer to our Assessment of Retail Capacity Potential Report which was submitted at the deposit stage in relation to Policy SSA8. Furthermore, we object to the comments that retail capacity should be more evenly spread between the northern and southern strategy areas and, in particular, that less should be allocated at Talbot Green. We consider that the strategic site allocation at Mwyndy/Talbot Green is entirely in accordance with National Policy and the Wales Spatial Plan which identifies the area as a Strategic Opportunity Area and specifically identifies Llantrisant as a "hub settlement". The allocation of site SSA8 will provide the local policy support to this national policy and strategic aspiration.</p> <p>Representation D7</p> <p>We object to the statement that the Tesco store at Talbot Green is the anchor to the remainder of the defined centre and that any impact upon it would harm the vitality and viability of the store and the centre as a whole. The Tesco store is in fact poorly related to the rest of the existing district centre and, in association with the Talbot Green Shopping Park, overwhelming caters for car borne trade. Furthermore, it is widely acknowledged that the Tesco store over trades to a very significant degree and, as such, a reduction of trade at this particular store could be accommodated without harm to the vitality or viability of either the store or the centre as a whole. Indeed, a reduction of trade may actually benefit the store and the centre by reducing congestion both within the store and on associated car parks and highways.</p> <p>Finally, it can be stated with certainty that no sequentially preferable sites exist in, or on the edge of, the existing Talbot Green district centre to accommodate the identified need either in terms of floorspace or, particularly, in terms of the need to provide a new town centre as a destination to serve the upgraded settlement of Llantrisant and its environs. The site allocated for the new town centre is highly accessible by all modes of travel and in this regard we refer to the Savill Bird &amp; Axon Transport Report (March 2009) and the further transportation note prepared specifically to rebut representations made by representor 3313 (Talbot Green Shopping Park).</p> <p>Representation D8</p> <p>We object to the statement made on behalf of Tesco that the retail development of the size and nature proposed in the Deposit Plan for the principle town of Llantrisant/Talbot Green will be to the detriment of the vitality and viability of the existing town centre and would draw investment, expenditure and footfall out of that centre in conflict with the objectives of PPW and MIPPS 02/2005. We objected to the Deposit Plan allocation in terms of the quantum of retail space proposed for the strategic site SSA8 on the basis that further retail floorspace was required to achieve the aims of the Wales Spatial Plan. We supported our comments with an assessment of retail capacity potential and it is this report that provides a robust and up to date assessment as called for in the Tesco representations.</p> <p>While Tesco claim that the proposed new retail allocation would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales due to potential impacts on the existing district centre, they fail to appreciate that PPW requires local planning authorities to assess the need for further retail floorspace and, if such need exists, allocate the most sequentially preferable site to meet that need. It is precisely this process that has led the local planning authority to include a requirement for a new town centre in the Talbot Green/Mwyndy strategic site. They have done so on the basis significant and carefully prepared retail analysis which, it is noted, is not disputed in detail by any representations received at the Deposit Plan stage. There can be no doubt that the approach taken by the local planning authority is entirely consistent with national policy and, furthermore, would pursue the aims of the Wales Spatial Plan in respect of the Llantrisant hub settlement and the Strategic Opportunity Area.</p> <p>Representation D15</p> <p>While Tesco claim that the proposed new retail allocation would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales due to potential impacts on the existing district centre, as set out above, they fail to appreciate that PPW requires local planning authorities to assess the need for further retail floorspace and, if such need exists, allocate the most sequentially preferable site to meet that need. It is precisely this process that has led the local planning authority to include a requirement for a new town centre. There can be no doubt that the approach taken by the local planning authority is entirely consistent with national policy. Indeed, we note that no objection has been raised in respect of any of the Consistency Tests of soundness in this regard.</p> <p>Tesco then seek to suggest that the existing Talbot Green district centre is successful with a very high level of trade retention. This is entirely contrary to the Council's own evidence base prepared by</p>															

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners and our own assessment of retail capacity potential submitted in support of our representations at the Deposit Plan stage. The household survey information that these reports were based on indicate that the convenience good retention rate within Zone 4, which is the zone within which the Talbot Green district centre is located, is just 55% which is particularly low for convenience goods shopping. The figure is lower still at 31% for comparison goods retention within Zone 4. It is clear therefore that the wholly unsubstantiated comments made within the representations submitted by Tesco do not accord with the empirical research undertaken in the form of household shopping survey.

Tesco go on to query the process by which strategic site SSA8 has come to be allocated, and specifically the new town centre within it. The process which the local planning authority followed in this regard, including a candidate site assessment methodology and the sustainability appraisal is fully set out on the Council's website available for all interested parties to view. There can be no doubt that the Council assessed many candidate sites put forward by members of the public before drawing up their Deposit Plan and allocating specific sites for specific uses within it. It is clear that the Plan can be considered as "sound" in respect of the process of site allocation that has been adopted. Indeed, it is noted that no objections are raised in respect of the Procedural Tests P1 or P2 in this regard.

The representation from Tesco also raises issues relating to highways and landscaping and visual amenity. We enclose a transportation note from Savill Bird and Axon and a supporting Landscape Statement from Randall Thorpe which address the specific issues raised.

The Tesco representation also goes on to raise issues in respect of ecology and encloses a "Briefing note – identification of potential ecological issues" (March 2009). Perhaps the principle issue to note here is that, as the title of the note suggests, the Aspect Ecology briefing note seeks to identify potential ecological issues and, as clarified at paragraph 1.2, is based on a "rapid ecological survey... to appraise the habitats present within the site and... their potential to support protected, notable or BAP species". Despite Aspect Ecology's "expertise in advising with regards to mitigation solutions where significant ecological issues are identified... so that in most cases both the planned developments and any significant ecological interests can be fully accommodated" (Aspect Ecology website – see attached extract), it is clear that their briefing note of March 2009 makes no attempt to consider the potential for mitigation of any of the issues raised therein. Furthermore, their "rapid ecological survey" is no substitute for the thorough and iterative ecological survey and analysis that has been carried out by RPS and submitted at the time of the Deposit Plan consultation process (see our covering letter of 20th March 2009). This absence of thorough survey work leads to very vague wording within the Aspect Ecology note often simply referring to an area having the potential to support a range of noteworthy species. It is not considered that it is appropriate to base the decision as to whether to allocate or not allocate the site on this type of vague statement.

In respect of some of the more specific comments made within the Access Ecology note we comment as follows:

In paragraph 3.3 attention is drawn to the importance of continuous habitats which are essential for migration dispersal and genetic exchange. We would note that the proposed development illustrated on the Indicative Concept Plan forming part of the Deposit LDP would not sever any such continuous habitat. The town centre allocation falls primarily on brownfield land of no ecological importance and the housing allocation borders existing development and infrastructure on three sides. Indeed, much of the proposed housing allocation has been granted outline planning permission under appeal reference: A-PP158-98-qA694534 issued on the 23rd October 2008. Similarly much of the employment allocation to the east of the A4119 was also granted permission by the same outline consent. It is not considered therefore that the development envisaged by strategic site SSA8 would harm any continuous structure of habitat currently present on the site.

We consider that the negative assertions made in paragraph 3.5 are able to be appropriately dealt with at the development control stage of the planning process and are in no way unusual to developments of this nature. Indeed, very similar issues were raised by the above mentioned employment/housing proposal which was granted permission by the Welsh Ministers in October of last year. The ecological issues raised were fully considered in the Environmental Statement and mitigation measures suggested to ensure that any residual impact was acceptable. We see no reason why the further development envisaged by the Deposit LDP is not able to be dealt with in similar fashion.

The assertion made at paragraph 3.6 that human activity will be likely to increase pressure on adjacent SINC's seems to take no account of the existence of SINC's in very close proximity to existing substantial residential development (e.g. the Cefn Hendy Community Woodlands SINC is virtually surrounded on all sides by significant residential development). The author of the Aspect Ecology note seems to mistake the open space notation on the Indicative Concept Plan for recreational Public Open Space. This is an error as the open space on the indicative concept plan simply represents the fact that that area of land will remain undeveloped. It is not the case that the area will form some kind of formal or informal Public Open Space provision associated with the adjacent development.

The conclusion of paragraph 3.7 that the Deposit Local Development Plan is contrary to national and local policy in the habitats regulations and the NERC Act seems to take no account of Technical Advice Note 5 (Consultation Draft – January 2006) which confirms at paragraph 5.7.3 in relation to Local Sites (including SINC's) that "developers should avoid harm to those interests where possible. Where harm is unavoidable it should be minimized by mitigation measures and offset as far as possible by compensation measures designed to ensure that there is no reduction in the overall nature conservation value of the area or feature". Aspect Ecology have undertaken no assessment of the ability to mitigate any impact arising from the proposal. Without having undertaken such an assessment it is unhelpful and misleading to suggest that the Deposit Plan is contrary to policy and legislation. Indeed, we note that no objection has been raised in respect of any of the Consistency Tests of soundness in this regard.

In respect of paragraph 3.9 we would note that the Afon Clun is some considerable distance away from any of the areas indicated for development on the Indicative Concept Plan.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

In respect of paragraph 4.2 it should be noted that the hydrological regime of this part of the site is likely to be primarily influenced by the Afon Clun. The proposed town centre site is situated on higher land (see the Flood Consequence Assessment submitted as part of our Deposit Plan representations and, indeed, the Strategic Flood Assessment forming part of the Council's evidence base) and accordingly is unlikely to have a significant effect.

To the extent that any of the proposed areas of development identified on the Indicative Concept Plan coincide with SINC designations, matters have been fully addressed in the ecological report (Review of implications for a proposed access road across Pant Marsh (RPS – 2009)). This report concluded that there is the potential for ecological benefit resulting from the development through the management of adjacent land and accordingly the questions raised in paragraph 4.10 of the Aspect Ecology note are fully addressed.

The failure to have regard to the Indicative Concept Plan and the fact that significant elements of strategic site SSA8 are not proposed to be subject to development, is again clear at paragraph 4.13. Great Crested Newts and bats are only known to be present on areas south of the strategic site boundary or on areas to the east of the A4119 which is already subject to planning permission for development (see above). This is confirmed in Table 1 of Access Ecology's note and renders the conclusions at 4.14 and, indeed, 6.4, unsound.

It is interesting to note that towards the end of the Aspect Ecology paper (paragraph 6.17 and 6.19 in respect of Dormice and Water Voles) recognition is given to the possibility of providing appropriate mitigation measures to safeguard the relevant species from the potential negative impacts of development. As already stated, this potential exists in respect of all of the potential impacts alluded to in the Note and we have no doubt that had Aspect Ecology been commissioned to consider such potential mitigation, very different and far more robust conclusions could have been drawn.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
-------------	-----------------	--------------	------------------------

2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	
---	---	---	--

It would allow the relevant policy/allocation to remain as set out in the Deposit Plan which, subject to the representation we made at the Deposit Stage, would meet the relevant tests of soundness.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>3295.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1190/ASD026 SSA 8 - Mwyndy / Talbot Green						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Comments on behalf of Valad Developments (Llantrisant) Ltd in relation to RREEF & SWIP (REPRESENTOR 3313)  
Q.4 continuation sheet...

Representation D2

We object to the statement made on behalf of RREEF & SWIP that the retail development of the size and nature proposed in the Deposit Plan for the principle town of Llantrisant/Talbot Green will be to the detriment of the vitality and viability of the existing town centre and conflict with the objectives of PPW and MIPPS 02/2005. We objected to the Deposit Plan allocation in terms of the quantum of retail space proposed for the strategic site SSA8 on the basis that further retail floorspace was required to achieve the aims of the Wales Spatial Plan.

While RREEF & SWIP claim that the proposed new retail allocation would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales due to potential impacts on the existing district centre, they fail to appreciate that PPW requires local planning authorities to assess the need for further retail floorspace and, if such need exists, allocate the most sequentially preferable site to meet that need. It is precisely this process that has led the local planning authority to include a requirement for a new town centre in the Talbot Green/Mwyndy strategic site. They have done so on the basis significant and carefully prepared retail analysis which, it is noted, is not disputed in detail by any representations received at the Deposit Plan stage. There can be no doubt that the approach taken by the local planning authority is entirely consistent with national policy and, furthermore, would pursue the aims of the Wales Spatial Plan in respect of the Llantrisant hub settlement and the Strategic Opportunity Area. Indeed, we note that no objection has been raised in respect of any of the Consistency Tests of soundness in this regard.

RREEF & SWIP then seek to suggest that the existing Talbot Green district centre is successful with a very high level of trade retention. This is entirely contrary to the Council's own evidence base prepared by Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners and our own assessment of retail capacity potential submitted in support of our representations at the Deposit Plan stage. The household survey information that these reports were based on indicate that the convenience good retention rate within Zone 4, which is the zone within which the Talbot Green district centre is located, is just 55% which is particularly low for convenience goods shopping. The figure is lower still at 31% for comparison goods retention within Zone 4. It is clear therefore that the wholly unsubstantiated comments made within the representations do not accord with the empirical research undertaken in the form of household shopping survey.

RREEF & SWIP go on to query the process by which strategic site SSA8 has come to be allocated, and specifically the new town centre within it. The process which the local planning authority followed in this regard, including a candidate site assessment methodology and the sustainability appraisal is fully set out on the Council's website available for all interested parties to view. There can be no doubt that the Council assessed many candidate sites put forward by members of the public before drawing up their Deposit Plan and allocating specific sites for specific uses within it. It is clear that the Plan can be considered as "sound" in respect of the process of site allocation that has been adopted. Indeed, it is noted that no objections are raised in respect of the Procedural Tests P1 or P2 in this regard.

RREEF & SWIP enclose a Transportation Note prepared by Pinnacle Transportation (Reference 0903-50/REP/01). Many of the points set out within this note are already covered by the Savill Bird & Axon Transport Report (March 2009) submitted in support of our Deposit Plan Representations. However, a further transportation note is enclosed with these Representations specifically addressing the Pinnacle Transportation note.

Representation D3

We object to the statement made on behalf of RREEF & SWIP that the retail allocation is based on dated information sources. Furthermore, we objected to the Deposit Plan allocation in terms of the quantum of retail space proposed for the strategic site SSA8 on the basis that further retail floorspace was required to achieve the aims of the Wales Spatial Plan. We supported our comments with an assessment of retail capacity potential and this report that provides a further robust and up to date assessment.

Representation D6

We object to the statement made on behalf of RREEF & SWIP that the retail allocation is based on dated information sources. As set out above, we supported our Deposit Representations with an assessment of retail capacity potential and this report that provides a further robust and up to date assessment.

The RREEF & SWIP objection raises the issue of the different approach taken to the north and south strategic policy areas with the majority of retail floorspace allocation going to the southern policy area. They claim this is inconsistent with national guidance although do not quote any relevant national guidance to back this point up. Indeed, we note that no objection has been raised in respect of

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

any of the Consistency Tests of soundness in this regard. They also claim that such an approach is inconsistent with the core strategy of the plan. However, the plan makes clear that a different approach is taken between the northern and southern strategy areas in order to take full account of social, economic and environmental trends indicating that certain areas are in decline whilst others are experiencing growth. This, combined with the Wales Spatial Plan aspiration of Llantrisant becoming a hub settlement and the Strategic Opportunity Area in this part of South Wales clearly support the policy approach adopted by the local planning authority.

Further comments claim that the proposed new retail allocation would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales due to potential impacts on the existing district centre. As set out above, they fail to appreciate that PPW requires local planning authorities to assess the need for further retail floorspace and, if such need exists, allocate the most sequentially preferable site to meet that need. It is precisely this process that has led the local planning authority to include a requirement for a new town centre. There can be no doubt that the approach taken by the local planning authority is entirely consistent with national policy. Indeed, we note that no objection has been raised in respect of any of the Consistency Tests of soundness in this regard.

The objection goes on to assert that no account has been taken of the potential to disaggregate the proposed floorspace onto sites within or immediately adjacent to Talbot Green district centre or, indeed, Pontypridd. Pontypridd has its own retail allocations which are unrelated to those associated with strategic site SSA8. It is noted that RREEF & SWIP do not offer any substantiation to their assertion regarding the ability to disaggregate and, furthermore, this approach takes no account of the need for a new town centre to serve the upgraded settlement of Llantrisant. No sequentially preferable site has come forward as part of the Candidate Site exercise and it is precisely this fact that has led to the local planning authority designating the north western part of SSA8 for a new town centre. The site is highly accessible by all modes of travel as confirmed by the March 2009 Savill Bird & Axon Transport Report and, indeed the enclosed Supplementary Transport Note.

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
------	----------	-------	-----------------

2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	
---	---	---	--

It would allow the relevant policy/allocation to remain as et out in the Deposit Plan which, subject to the representation we made at the Deposit Stage, would meet the relevant tests of soundness.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>3296.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 934/ASN144 SSA 10.2 - Trane Farm										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	--	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

See attached response letter and Self Assessment Forms.

I refer to the current exercise where representations are being invited on the above document. Our recent meeting of 24th June, also refers.

In response please find below and enclosed, representations which we are submitting on behalf of Dorchester Land Ltd regarding land at Trane Farm, Tonyrefail.

Our comments are set out under the following headings:-

- Response to the Representations Submitted which include objections to the site's allocation
- Additional Representations which include an assessment of the additional sites proposed to be included as part of a larger site area against recognised Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) Objectives.

As well as this letter, schedules are enclosed (which assess the two areas of land to the west and east of the site), together with a completed Representations Form.

Response to the Representations Submitted

In the first instance my Clients are generally pleased with the relatively low level of objections which have been forthcoming, considering the scale of the proposals. Nevertheless, they acknowledge that all objections are valid and will need to be addressed.

The objections fall into two categories, those relating to the inclusion of the Site of Special Scientific Interest within the site boundaries, and those which are of a more general nature, from local residents concerned regarding the scale of residential development identified for the Tonyrefail area in the Deposit LDP.

These are discussed in turn below.

Objections from the Countryside Council for Wales and the Wildlife Trust (References 1632.D94 and 107.D2)

My clients accept that the land notified as a Site of Special Scientific Interest will need to be excluded from the developable area, and management measures will be required to safeguard its specific characteristics.

It is noted that both sets of representations are mainly concerned about the inclusion of the land, part of the Rhos Tonyrefail SSSI, within a proposed housing land allocation. If it were considered necessary, therefore, we would accept the exclusion of the land concerned from the overall allocation if it resulted in the removal of objections from these bodies.

However, My Clients wish to work with both the CCW and the Council in developing an appropriate layout for the site which would take into account the protected areas, and other parts of the site which are sensitive in ecological terms. In this context, discussions will be required which will seek to establish the management measures necessary in order to

- maintain and enhance the special quality of the land, in terms of the degree of restriction of public access etc
- ascertain to what extent development can take place in the proximity of the SSSI;
- establish the degree to which the land, if retained within the site boundary, contributes to overall amenity and open space provision.

It is therefore the intention to involve the CCW, the Council's Ecologist and local nature conservation bodies in formulating principles for the protection and enhancement of habitats, which will contribute to a comprehensive 'masterplan' for the site as a whole.

Objections by Individuals concerned by the Proposed Scale of Development in Tonyrefail (References 3052.D4 and 3139.D1)

The SSSI issue which is covered above is also referred to in Representation 3052.D4.

Otherwise the main concerns expressed in the objections relate to the capacity of infrastructure and services in Tonyrefail to accommodate the scale of additional residential development proposed. It is noted that these objections are also reflected in relation to those submitted in respect of other developments proposed in the area.



Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

In many respects the objections are unfounded as Tonyrefail benefits from good road infrastructure and is generally well served by employment and other services, notably leisure facilities. The town centre, although relatively small in scale has a low vacancy rate compared with other towns in Rhondda Cynon Taf.

The comprehensive development of the site proposed will assist in addressing other shortfalls referred to in the objections, particularly as there is a requirement for a new primary school to be accommodated as part of the site layout. As with other aspects of the overall scheme, the question of the scale of contributions, however, will need to be the subject of further negotiations and that contributions from other developers will be necessary in order to ensure that the school is completed at an early stage of the site's development.

A new access to serve the development will also enable bus services to penetrate the site. Opportunities may also exist for a small 'centre' to be accommodated as part of the scheme which could incorporate community facilities such as a doctor's surgery, local shops, pharmacy etc.

In addition, representations 3259 D1 and D2 have been submitted by an individual promoting the inclusion of additional land to the west and these are welcomed and supported on this basis.

#### Additional Representations

The representations submitted at the Deposit stage by Asbri Planning (Ref 3296) included objections on the basis that additional areas of land should be included within the development site area. These relate to Sites A and C on the enclosed Plan (Site B as an extension to the Cemetery was proposed to be removed from the allocation).

Site A, in the western part of the site would consolidate the development, particularly as the westernmost parcel, north of the B4278, Giffach Road, will be isolated by the SSSI designation. It would therefore be required to accommodate a link route through the site.

It is also proposed that, as the land is more gently sloping than other parts of the site, it would be an appropriate site to accommodate the proposed new primary school. If the school buildings and access route (also serving the school) were confined to the south-eastern part of the site, with the remainder retained as open land for play and other requirements, the need to retain a gap between Tonyrefail and Hendreforgan would not be compromised. The Council's Education Procurement Officer has confirmed that the siting of the school at this location, which would be some 750 metres from the existing Hendreforgan School would not present a problem as firm catchment boundaries would be applied.

Site C proposes an extension of the proposed allocated site at its eastern end, in the vicinity of a ruined farmhouse overlooking the slope which leads down to Tonyrefail Town Centre. As the land partly occupies a 'plateau' area its development would contribute to an improved site layout which would maximise the overall land resource. An open 'backdrop' to the town centre at its western end would continue to be maintained.

Accompanying schedules in Appendix 1, which show how the additional site areas perform against SA/SEA objectives, adopted by the Council as part of its site selection methodology, illustrate that the inclusion of these sites would be wholly compatible with these objectives.

#### Conclusions

It can therefore be concluded that the objections submitted on the above grounds are unfounded and will be further addressed by detailed aspects of the emerging scheme which will consider nature conservation and the provision of infrastructure and facilities.

The inclusion of the additional areas of land in the proposed residential land allocation meet SA/SEA objectives (Appendix 1 refers) and will positively contribute to the overall scheme by allowing a more efficient use of land and by accommodating land for a new primary school as requested by the Council.

#### APPENDIX 1

The following tables assess the additional sites being promoted for inclusion in the proposed LDP Housing Land Allocation SSA 10.2. This is done on the basis of the Stage 2 Site Assessment Methodology adopted by Rhondda Cynon Taf CBC by appraising each site against established Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment SA/SEA objectives.

TABLE 1 – Site A on the attached Plan, Land to the west of Proposed Housing Land Allocation SSA 10.2

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l	SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
Objective - Existing Threshold Management Option - Revised Threshold															
1. Provide for the overall housing requirements through a mix of dwelling types catering for all needs to promote integrated and thriving communities - Blue The proposed additional site area would assist in achieving a more comprehensive form of development, helping in turn to meet the objective. - Blue															
2. Promote and protect the culture and heritage including landscape, archaeology and language - Blue - The proposed primary school in the south-eastern part of the additional site area will allow an open gap to be retained between settlements. Blue															
3. Promote integrated communities, with opportunities for living, working and socialising for all. Blue The additional site area will ensure that land for a primary school in a landscaped setting will be provided, as a focus for the new community Blue															
4. Provide an environment that encourages a healthy and safe lifestyle and promotes well being. Blue The proposed extension to the site will allow for increased recreation provision along the corridor of the Nant Eirin stream. Blue															
5. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable modes of transport. Blue A new road access into the western part of the site to serve a primary school and the residential scheme would enable penetration by public transport services. Blue															
6. Minimise waste, especially waste to landfill and making adequate provision for waste facilities in accordance with the findings of the Regional Waste Plan.															
7. Provide for a sustainable economy Blue Jobs will be created on site in construction and by the development of new school and other community facilities. Blue															
8. Provide for a diverse range of job opportunities															
9. Promote efficient and appropriate use of minerals including the safeguarding of resources and ensuring that adequate reserves are allocated to meet local, regional and national needs.															
10. Improve, protect and enhance the landscape and countryside Yellow Good landscaping and shared recreation facilities will enhance this part of the site as a countryside resource. Green															
11. Protect and enhance the diversity and abundance of wildlife habitats and native species Yellow The presence of the SSSI limits options on the western part of the site – additional land incorporated in the site boundary will allow for more effective management. It will also allow more available options for the proposed alignment of the site distributor road to ensure that there will be less impact on the protected area. Green															
12. Improve, protect and enhance the water environment															
13. Manage the effects of climate change. Blue The development is close to shops, services and employment areas and the need to travel will be reduced. Blue															
14. Increase the supply of renewable energy and reduce energy consumption Blue New homes and buildings, including the proposed primary school will meet Sustainable Building Targets as required by TAN 22 □Blue															
15. Promote efficient use of land and soils Green The incorporation of the additional land will achieve a more efficient use of the land as a resource Blue															
16. Provide a high quality built environment that promotes community pride. Yellow The proposed primary school in the south-eastern part of the additional site area will provide a landmark building in an open setting which will allow an open gap to be retained between settlements Green															

TABLE 2 – Site C on the attached Plan, Land to the east of Proposed Housing Land Allocation SSA 10.2

Objective - Existing Threshold - Management Option - Revised Threshold

1. Provide for the overall housing requirements through a mix of dwelling types catering for all needs to promote integrated and thriving communities Blue The proposed additional site area would assist in achieving a more comprehensive form of development, helping in turn to meet the objective. Blue
2. Promote and protect the culture and heritage including landscape, archaeology and language Yellow The development of that part of the site above Tonyrefail Town Centre would require particular consideration in design terms. However the most visible part of the site is occupied by a derelict ruin, Cae'r Gwerlais Isaf, where there are opportunities for its replacement by a landmark building or feature which would overlook the retained open area as a backdrop to the town. Green
3. Promote integrated communities, with opportunities for living, working and socialising for all. Blue As part of the overall scheme opportunities exist for a range and mix of accommodation, including that to meet the needs of the elderly. The eastern part of the site is well suited due to the spectacular views available across the Ely valley. Blue
4. Provide an environment that encourages a healthy and safe lifestyle and promotes well being. Blue Although footpath links to the town centre are steep, the incorporation of the additional land could assist the regarding of paths to allow more widespread use by walkers and cyclists. Blue
5. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable modes of transport. Blue As above. □Blue
6. Minimise waste, especially waste to landfill and making adequate provision for waste facilities in accordance with the findings of the Regional Waste Plan.
7. Provide for a sustainable economy Blue Elderly accommodation, including a potential 'retirement village' would provide additional job opportunities on site. Blue
8. Provide for a diverse range of job opportunities
9. Promote efficient and appropriate use of minerals including the safeguarding of resources and ensuring that adequate reserves are allocated to meet local, regional and national needs.
10. Improve, protect and enhance the landscape and countryside Yellow A sympathetic form of development with appropriate landscaping would seek to enhance the setting of the town whilst maintaining the existing green area which slopes down to the Town Centre. Green
11. Protect and enhance the diversity and abundance of wildlife habitats and native species Green The eastern part of the site is not affected by the SSSI designation and as such opportunities will

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
																arise for improving habitats and enhancing wildlife corridors from the east to central parts of the site. Blue
																12. Improve, protect and enhance the water environment
																13. Manage the effects of climate change Blue The development is close to shops, services and employment areas and the need to travel will be reduced. Blue
																14 Increase the supply of renewable energy and reduce energy consumption Blue New homes and buildings will meet Sustainable Building Targets as required by TAN 22. The site is also on a south-facing slope. Blue
																15. Promote efficient use of land and soils Green The incorporation of the additional land will achieve a more efficient use of the land as a resource Blue
																16. Provide a high quality built environment that promotes community pride. Yellow The development of the additional land will help achieve continuity in design and landscaping terms and will foster improved links to existing footpaths. Green

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	The inclusion of the additional sites would assist in meeting procedural coherence and effectiveness test CE2 and CE4	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>3296.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 991/ASN145 Land at Trane Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

-----  
*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	--	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

See attached response letter and Self Assessment Forms.

I refer to the current exercise where representations are being invited on the above document. Our recent meeting of 24th June, also refers.

In response please find below and enclosed, representations which we are submitting on behalf of Dorchester Land Ltd regarding land at Trane Farm, Tonyrefail.

Our comments are set out under the following headings:-

- Response to the Representations Submitted which include objections to the site's allocation
- Additional Representations which include an assessment of the additional sites proposed to be included as part of a larger site area against recognised Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) Objectives.

As well as this letter, schedules are enclosed (which assess the two areas of land to the west and east of the site), together with a completed Representations Form.

Response to the Representations Submitted

In the first instance my Clients are generally pleased with the relatively low level of objections which have been forthcoming, considering the scale of the proposals. Nevertheless, they acknowledge that all objections are valid and will need to be addressed.

The objections fall into two categories, those relating to the inclusion of the Site of Special Scientific Interest within the site boundaries, and those which are of a more general nature, from local residents concerned regarding the scale of residential development identified for the Tonyrefail area in the Deposit LDP.

These are discussed in turn below.

Objections from the Countryside Council for Wales and the Wildlife Trust (References 1632.D94 and 107.D2)

My clients accept that the land notified as a Site of Special Scientific Interest will need to be excluded from the developable area, and management measures will be required to safeguard its specific characteristics.

It is noted that both sets of representations are mainly concerned about the inclusion of the land, part of the Rhos Tonyrefail SSSI, within a proposed housing land allocation. If it were considered necessary, therefore, we would accept the exclusion of the land concerned from the overall allocation if it resulted in the removal of objections from these bodies.

However, My Clients wish to work with both the CCW and the Council in developing an appropriate layout for the site which would take into account the protected areas, and other parts of the site which are sensitive in ecological terms. In this context, discussions will be required which will seek to establish the management measures necessary in order to

- a)  maintain and enhance the special quality of the land, in terms of the degree of restriction of public access etc
- b)  ascertain to what extent development can take place in the proximity of the SSSI;
- c)  establish the degree to which the land, if retained within the site boundary, contributes to overall amenity and open space provision.

It is therefore the intention to involve the CCW, the Council's Ecologist and local nature conservation bodies in formulating principles for the protection and enhancement of habitats, which will contribute to a comprehensive 'masterplan' for the site as a whole.

Objections by Individuals concerned by the Proposed Scale of Development in Tonyrefail (References 3052.D4 and 3139.D1)

The SSSI issue which is covered above is also referred to in Representation 3052.D4.

Otherwise the main concerns expressed in the objections relate to the capacity of infrastructure and services in Tonyrefail to accommodate the scale of additional residential development proposed. It is noted that these objections are also reflected in relation to those submitted in respect of other developments proposed in the area.

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT</i> <i>Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE</i> <i>in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID.</i> <i>Add'l</i>	<i>SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
-----------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

In many respects the objections are unfounded as Tonyrefail benefits from good road infrastructure and is generally well served by employment and other services, notably leisure facilities. The town centre, although relatively small in scale has a low vacancy rate compared with other towns in Rhondda Cynon Taf.

The comprehensive development of the site proposed will assist in addressing other shortfalls referred to in the objections, particularly as there is a requirement for a new primary school to be accommodated as part of the site layout. As with other aspects of the overall scheme, the question of the scale of contributions, however, will need to be the subject of further negotiations and that contributions from other developers will be necessary in order to ensure that the school is completed at an early stage of the site's development.

A new access to serve the development will also enable bus services to penetrate the site. Opportunities may also exist for a small 'centre' to be accommodated as part of the scheme which could incorporate community facilities such as a doctor's surgery, local shops, pharmacy etc.

In addition, representations 3259 D1 and D2 have been submitted by an individual promoting the inclusion of additional land to the west and these are welcomed and supported on this basis.

#### Additional Representations

The representations submitted at the Deposit stage by Asbri Planning (Ref 3296) included objections on the basis that additional areas of land should be included within the development site area. These relate to Sites A and C on the enclosed Plan (Site B as an extension to the Cemetery was proposed to be removed from the allocation).

Site A, in the western part of the site would consolidate the development, particularly as the westernmost parcel, north of the B4278, Giffach Road, will be isolated by the SSSI designation. It would therefore be required to accommodate a link route through the site.

It is also proposed that, as the land is more gently sloping than other parts of the site, it would be an appropriate site to accommodate the proposed new primary school. If the school buildings and access route (also serving the school) were confined to the south-eastern part of the site, with the remainder retained as open land for play and other requirements, the need to retain a gap between Tonyrefail and Hendreforgan would not be compromised. The Council's Education Procurement Officer has confirmed that the siting of the school at this location, which would be some 750 metres from the existing Hendreforgan School would not present a problem as firm catchment boundaries would be applied.

Site C proposes an extension of the proposed allocated site at its eastern end, in the vicinity of a ruined farmhouse overlooking the slope which leads down to Tonyrefail Town Centre. As the land partly occupies a 'plateau' area its development would contribute to an improved site layout which would maximise the overall land resource. An open 'backdrop' to the town centre at its western end would continue to be maintained.

Accompanying schedules in Appendix 1, which show how the additional site areas perform against SA/SEA objectives, adopted by the Council as part of its site selection methodology, illustrate that the inclusion of these sites would be wholly compatible with these objectives.

#### Conclusions

It can therefore be concluded that the objections submitted on the above grounds are unfounded and will be further addressed by detailed aspects of the emerging scheme which will consider nature conservation and the provision of infrastructure and facilities.

The inclusion of the additional areas of land in the proposed residential land allocation meet SA/SEA objectives (Appendix 1 refers) and will positively contribute to the overall scheme by allowing a more efficient use of land and by accommodating land for a new primary school as requested by the Council.

#### APPENDIX 1

The following tables assess the additional sites being promoted for inclusion in the proposed LDP Housing Land Allocation SSA 10.2. This is done on the basis of the Stage 2 Site Assessment Methodology adopted by Rhondda Cynon Taf CBC by appraising each site against established Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment SA/SEA objectives.

TABLE 1 – Site A on the attached Plan, Land to the west of Proposed Housing Land Allocation SSA 10.2

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
				Objective	Existing Threshold	Management Option	Revised Threshold							
				1.	Provide for the overall housing requirements through a mix of dwelling types catering for all needs to promote integrated and thriving communities	Blue	The proposed additional site area would assist in achieving a more comprehensive form of development, helping in turn to meet the objective.	Blue						
				2.	Promote and protect the culture and heritage including landscape, archaeology and language	Blue	The proposed primary school in the south-eastern part of the additional site area will allow an open gap to be retained between settlements.	Blue						
				3.	Promote integrated communities, with opportunities for living, working and socialising for all.	Blue	The additional site area will ensure that land for a primary school in a landscaped setting will be provided, as a focus for the new community	Blue						
				4.	Provide an environment that encourages a healthy and safe lifestyle and promotes well being.	Blue	The proposed extension to the site will allow for increased recreation provision along the corridor of the Nant Eirin stream.	Blue						
				5.	Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable modes of transport.	Blue	A new road access into the western part of the site to serve a primary school and the residential scheme would enable penetration by public transport services.	Blue						
				6.	Minimise waste, especially waste to landfill and making adequate provision for waste facilities in accordance with the findings of the Regional Waste Plan.									
				7.	Provide for a sustainable economy	Blue	Jobs will be created on site in construction and by the development of new school and other community facilities.	Blue						
				8.	Provide for a diverse range of job opportunities									
				9.	Promote efficient and appropriate use of minerals including the safeguarding of resources and ensuring that adequate reserves are allocated to meet local, regional and national needs.									
				10.	Improve, protect and enhance the landscape and countryside	Yellow	Good landscaping and shared recreation facilities will enhance this part of the site as a countryside resource.	Green						
				11.	Protect and enhance the diversity and abundance of wildlife habitats and native species	Yellow	The presence of the SSSI limits options on the western part of the site – additional land incorporated in the site boundary will allow for more effective management. It will also allow more available options for the proposed alignment of the site distributor road to ensure that there will be less impact on the protected area.	Green						
				12.	Improve, protect and enhance the water environment									
				13.	Manage the effects of climate change.	Blue	The development is close to shops, services and employment areas and the need to travel will be reduced.	Blue						
				14.	Increase the supply of renewable energy and reduce energy consumption	Blue	New homes and buildings, including the proposed primary school will meet Sustainable Building Targets as required by TAN 22	Blue						
				15.	Promote efficient use of land and soils	Green	The incorporation of the additional land will achieve a more efficient use of the land as a resource	Blue						
				16.	Provide a high quality built environment that promotes community pride.	Yellow	The proposed primary school in the south-eastern part of the additional site area will provide a landmark building in an open setting which will allow an open gap to be retained between settlements	Green						

TABLE 2 – Site C on the attached Plan, Land to the east of Proposed Housing Land Allocation SSA 10.2

				Objective	Existing Threshold	Management Option	Revised Threshold							
				1.	Provide for the overall housing requirements through a mix of dwelling types catering for all needs to promote integrated and thriving communities	Blue	The proposed additional site area would assist in achieving a more comprehensive form of development, helping in turn to meet the objective.	Blue						
				2.	Promote and protect the culture and heritage including landscape, archaeology and language	Yellow	The development of that part of the site above Tonyrefail Town Centre would require particular consideration in design terms. However the most visible part of the site is occupied by a derelict ruin, Cae'r Gwerlais Isaf, where there are opportunities for its replacement by a landmark building or feature which would overlook the retained open area as a backdrop to the town.	Green						
				3.	Promote integrated communities, with opportunities for living, working and socialising for all.	Blue	As part of the overall scheme opportunities exist for a range and mix of accommodation, including that to meet the needs of the elderly. The eastern part of the site is well suited due to the spectacular views available across the Ely valley.	Blue						
				4.	Provide an environment that encourages a healthy and safe lifestyle and promotes well being.	Blue	Although footpath links to the town centre are steep, the incorporation of the additional land could assist the regarding of paths to allow more widespread use by walkers and cyclists.	Blue						
				5.	Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable modes of transport.	Blue	As above.	Blue						
				6.	Minimise waste, especially waste to landfill and making adequate provision for waste facilities in accordance with the findings of the Regional Waste Plan.									
				7.	Provide for a sustainable economy	Blue	Elderly accommodation, including a potential 'retirement village' would provide additional job opportunities on site.	Blue						
				8.	Provide for a diverse range of job opportunities									
				9.	Promote efficient and appropriate use of minerals including the safeguarding of resources and ensuring that adequate reserves are allocated to meet local, regional and national needs.									
				10.	Improve, protect and enhance the landscape and countryside	Yellow	A sympathetic form of development with appropriate landscaping would seek to enhance the setting of the town whilst maintaining the existing green area which slopes down to the Town Centre.	Green						
				11.	Protect and enhance the diversity and abundance of wildlife habitats and native species	Green	The eastern part of the site is not affected by the SSSI designation and as such opportunities will							

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l	SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
																arise for improving habitats and enhancing wildlife corridors from the east to central parts of the site. <input type="checkbox"/> Blue 12. Improve, protect and enhance the water environment <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Manage the effects of climate change. <input type="checkbox"/> Blue <input type="checkbox"/> The development is close to shops, services and employment areas and the need to travel will be reduced. <input type="checkbox"/> Blue 14. Increase the supply of renewable energy and reduce energy consumption <input type="checkbox"/> Blue <input type="checkbox"/> New homes and buildings will meet Sustainable Building Targets as required by TAN 22. The site is also on a south-facing slope. <input type="checkbox"/> Blue 15. Promote efficient use of land and soils <input type="checkbox"/> Green <input type="checkbox"/> The incorporation of the additional land will achieve a more efficient use of the land as a resource <input type="checkbox"/> Blue 16. Provide a high quality built environment that promotes community pride. <input type="checkbox"/> Yellow <input type="checkbox"/> The development of the additional land will help achieve continuity in design and landscaping terms and will foster improved links to existing footpaths. <input type="checkbox"/> Green

-----  
*Item Question* *Reply* **Soundness Tests**  
 -----

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 The inclusion of the additional sites would assist in meeting procedural coherence and effectiveness test CE2 and CE4

<b>3297.A1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>							
Document:						Site: 994/ASN093	Newtown Industrial Estate							PEX Session:		
Policy:			Map:					Issue:								
Summary:																

-----  
*Item Question* **Representation Text**  
 -----

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Please see attached Self Assessment Form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.

-----  
*Item Question* *Reply* **Soundness Tests**  
 -----

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.

<b>3299.A1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	S	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Document:						Site: 1009/ASN079	Land east of The Bungalow, Llantrisant Road							PEX Session:		
Policy:			Map:					Issue:								
Summary:																

-----  
*Item Question* **Representation Text**  
 -----

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 Please see attached Self Assessment Form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.

-----  
*Item Question* *Reply* **Soundness Tests**  
 -----

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3300.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 911/ASN094 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Please see attached Self Assessment Form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.

<b>3301.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:				Issue:								
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
SA/SEA and supporting information received. Yes

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
The inclusion of the site would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3302.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1092/ASS088						Land West of Darren Ddu Road			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Please see attached Self Assessment form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.		

<b>3304.A1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O	M		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Document:		Site: 951/ASN015						Land West of Abernant Road			PEX Session:			
Policy:		Map:						Issue:						
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Please see attached self assessment form for the site which relates its potential development to SA/SEA objectives.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The inclusion of the sites would assist in meeting coherence and effectiveness tests CE2 and CE4.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3308.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 908/ASN075 Ferrari's Bakery Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

There is a critical need for new retail facilities within Hirwaun as clearly documented in the Hirwaun Village Study (2008). However, it is clear that the site of the proposed allocation for new retail floor space (Land South of Hirwaun) is subject to a number of constraints, not least the fact that the majority of the development proposals for the site (including the proposed retail element) cannot be implemented until the dualling of the A465 trunk road through the site is completed. The Welsh Assembly Government has confirmed that works to this section of the A465 trunk road are unlikely to be completed before 2020.

Given that the strategic site allocated under policy NSA 8, is unlikely to come forward for retail uses before 2020, it is considered that alternative land which is capable of being developed in the short term should be allocated to meet the existing and immediate retail need that has been identified. Accordingly we support the Ferrari's Bakery site as an alternative site for mixed use development including a food store (2,000 sq m net), health centre and housing (9 units).

In addition to the representations made at the Deposit Plan stage in support of this site we would like to note that the site is easily accessible by all modes of transport including public transport and is capable of being served by vehicular access is a satisfactory way (indeed, a number of options exist in this regard). Please see the enclosed Site Accessibility Report prepared by Mayer Brown.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

It would allow the imminent need for further retail facilities, as well as housing and community facilities, to be met in the short term.

3309.A1

S W M

Document: Site: 1002/ASN176 Land to the west of Ynyshir

PEX Session:

Policy: Map: Issue:

Summary:

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I support alternative site 176 and 86 all be it with detailed and further amendments due to the strapness of part of the original site and possible land slip concerns at the rear of Cae Siriol. Please consider the attached map with the land shown hatched in orange for residential use and inclusion in the settlement boundary. Please consider the area hatched in blue for public open space and the area hatched in green as remaining existing allotments.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

As much of the land is brownfield and old iron sheds etc. The development would be an improvement to the area and a not within trees where possible. For the above reasons and considering test CE2 we feel this is a suitable site for alternative development.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3309.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1074/ASS086 Large area of land to the west of Ynyshir								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I support alternative site 176 and 86 all be it with detailed and further amendments due to the strapness of part of the original site and possible land slip concerns at the rear of Cae Siriol. Please consider the attached map with the land shown hatched in orange for residential use and inclusion in the settlement boundary. Please consider the area hatched in blue for public open space and the area hatched in green as remaining existing allotments.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? As much of the land is brownfield and old iron sheds etc. The development would be an improvement to the area and a not within trees where possible. For the above reasons and considering test CE2 we feel this is a suitable site for alternative development.		

<b>3368.A1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	S	M	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely								PEX Session:				
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.  SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.  By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.	No

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>3387.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1019/ASN025						Former Stelco Hardy Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	We support the application for the former Stelco Hardy Site to be used for "community use" as a site of this size could be more of a use to the community than extra housing stock. There is also a need for this type of facility in the area which will bring in employment prospects.	
	We support this application.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	There is an absence of small sites including Stelco Hardy that can be converted into community use such as a Dutch Barn style building or an equestrian centre.		
	Emphasis has been given closely to obesity and sedentary life styles that has become apparent in areas designated as "Deprived". The Treherbert Ward has been designated one such area and it is important that these issues are addressed.		
	A facility of this nature would be a step forward for the cohesiveness and effectiveness of a site this large.		
	Evidence can be shown that local residents would welcome and support this site for such a purpose.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3387.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Document: Site: 921/ASN021 Land off Michael's Road (Rhondda LP allocation - E) PEX Session:

Policy: Map: Issue:

Summary:

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
We object to this application because horse riding routes should be maintained to encourage tourism; We object to this application.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
We have been working with the local council and other agencies to promote and develop bridle ways that loop and link from mountain to mountain and through different council authorities.  
  
The proposed site at Blaencwm has an already existing bridle way runs across this site and is very well used.  
  
It is important for us to have bridle ways maintain and not taken away as the re-introduction of that bridle way can prove difficult.  
  
There is a huge equestrian following throughout the valleys and we would not like to see the elimination of this bridle way.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3387.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 921/ASN021 Land off Michael's Road (Rhondda LP allocation - E						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This site sits at the extreme end of the village of Blaencwm. It only became available for sale in 2004 after the Coal Board appealed to the Inspectorate to have its Open Access Land category revoked. It was sold to the Developer in 2007. The mountain above Blaencwm is being monitored as an area of potential landslide after the collapse in 1984. The site itself is a plateau, that overlooks the village and any buildings there would not only overshadow the village but in such a prominent position, would be visible right across the valley. The area to the North mentioned in the representation is the former Fernhill Colliery site, which in the Local Plan was in the Tourism and Leisure category by the creation of a Country Park.

The suggestion of a climbing centre is unfounded as any cliff faces in the area are unsuitable for this purpose as they are composed of the wrong type of rock to make this viable.

The whole of the village of Blaencwm, which consists of 136 homes, is outside the proposed settlement boundary. There has already been planning approval given for a further 50 homes prior to the LDP process.

This site would be subject to a land reclamation scheme as indicated by its category ENV11.2 in the Local Plan and there is a capped mine shaft close by if not within the site itself.

Its position overlooking the village, the disruption that will be caused to village life and the unsuitability of the scheme all indicate that this alternative site should be rejected.

I therefore strongly object to AS(N)21 Land at Michaels Road, Blaencwm as an Alternative Candidate Site under the category Tourism and Leisure.

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

This site fails the CE2 Coherence and Effectiveness Tests.

1. It has not been subjected to a sustainability appraisal.
2. It will disrupt village life being situated at the end of the village.
3. The landslide potential.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3387.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support this application for the Former Fernhill Colliery Site to be used for tourism and leisure. This alternative use of the site would be acceptable use of brown field site within the community with overwhelming support.  The Urban Capacity Study recommends its use as a Country Park.  We support this application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The proposal for a Country Park is the only viable use of this area which will protect the natural features, beautiful landscapes and waterfalls, and under policy CS13 the protection of the Natural environment including the 27 protected species that have been found on site. The site also provides for walkers, cyclists and horse riders that will enhance the tourism agenda and encourage visitors to our area. The site can at a future date incorporate accommodation for tourists this would help provide employment in our area.  Spine paths and cycle routes already exist linking the site to the village of Blaenrhondda and the surrounding areas. The loops and links routes are well used.  Its inclusion as Tourism & Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP more robust, provide employment and bring extra revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert Slopes) which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>3387.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to the application for the former Fernhill Colliery Site to be extended to accommodate additional development as there is no proven need/demand for future housing stock at the top end of the Rhondda Fawr.	

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
2	5			Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The Urban Capacity Study findings were that this site should be designated to tourism &amp; leisure. The proposed boundary change would increase new housing from 400 to 800 and would infringe on the Special Landscape area NSA 25-7 and the SINC Blaenrhondda slopes both of which are unacceptable.</p> <p>Technical difficulties in delivering this site in its proposed form include access and ground conditions both of which will impose high costs to the developer of the site and seriously affect its viability.</p> <p>Housing allocation will exceed the existing community's capacity for growth and will therefore need to rely on attracting people from other areas which will result in increased commuting to places of work.</p> <p>The site is isolated from the main village of Blaencwm therefore creating another village which will succumb to the same problems already existing in the 5 other villages in the Ward.</p> <p>Under Policy AW1 5.6 is the justification for the reduction of the allocation of houses from 14,500 new homes to the LDP requirement of 8,890 which is what we support. The need/demand for houses has not been proven the exodus of people leaving the top of the valley is more to do with the transport infrastructure than the availability of housing.</p> <p>There is no evidence that new houses are required at the top the Rhondda Fawr indeed there is evidence to show that there are approximately 4000 empty properties in the RCT the majority of which are in the northern area of RCT.</p> <p>There Mount Libanus Estate has in recent years has over 125 houses demolished as they were left derelict and there was no demand for housing.</p> <p>Policy SSA 12 affordable housing makes reference to `contributions which will be sought for the re-use/ rehabilitation of existing older stock` this in relation to existing empty properties should be given priority.</p> <p>The proposal for the development of the site for housing has not considered the modes of transport to the site. The increased traffic would only add to the already busy and narrow infrastructure at the top of the valley. The access to/from the Rhigos road would be on an ad hoc basis as it can be closed at a short notice due to adverse weather conditions and has in recent years been closed due to structural faults and landslips.</p> <p>The proposed boundary increase would put a strain on existing services within the area such as schools, doctors surgeries, dentists, water, waste management, traffic management to name a few.</p> <p>The proposed extension of the settlement boundary will not halve the trend of depopulation of the area it is the poor transport infrastructure that has necessitated a move south so that people can access their places of work easily and maintain quality of time with their families.</p> <p>The coal mining legacy of the area remains an important question the Coal Authority have listed potential problems as a result of the legacy that mining for coal has left. These are: Collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases. incidents of spontaneous combustion and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area where coal exists near the surface. A new planning department at the Coal Authority was created in 2008 to lead the work on defining areas where these legacy issues may occur. The Coal Authority states that the former Fernhill Colliery site is a substantial scale of mining legacy`. Since the Planning department has only been set up since 2008 little research has been undertaken to substantiate if the Fernhill site is in a condition to places (SP) houses on this site.</p>														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3387.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 880/ASN027						Former Stelco Hardy Site			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support the use of this land for employment purposes. Since the closure of the Stelco Hardy site and the Burberry Site for employment job prospects and opportunities in this area are severely limited.  We support this application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The infrastructure for business and industrial usage is still apparent on the site. Its closure in 2004 does not deter from the fact that as a community and under the Welsh Assembly Government's agenda to tackle economic inactivity we are working towards attracting inward investment.  With a mass influx of new houses the prospect of local jobs appears ludicrous. Work further down the valley or indeed outside the valley will attract local people to those areas to lay down their roots as it is nearer their place of work.  It is vital to create a balance of housing and employment to create/sustain communities.  Under Policy AW1 5.6 is the justification for the reduction of the allocation of houses from 14,500 new homes to the LDP requirement of 8,890 which is what we support. The need/demand for houses has not been proven the exodus of people leaving the top the valley is more to do with transport infrastructure than the availability of housing.  There is no evidence that new houses are required at the top of the Rhondda Fawr indeed there is no evidence to show that there are approximately 4000 empty properties in RCT the majority of which are in the northern area of RCT.  There Mount Libanus Estate has in recent years had over 125 houses demolished as they were left derelict and there was no demand for housing.  Unemployed has increased significantly (an increase in RCT of 11% equating to 7,196 people) and whilst the current economic crisis continues there is little prospect of people obtaining jobs. Treherbert has been declared 33rd. Most deprived are in Wales (Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005), the Stelco Hardy site is vital to the area for any proposed inward investment. Under the Welsh Assembly Government Communities First Programme the remit for Communities First Partnerships over the next few years includes addressing Economic Inactivity and Child Poverty amongst other headings.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3387.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 906/ASN159 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support this application for tourism and leisure use on this land as this would create much need employment in this area.  The beauty at the top of the Rhondda Fawr is breath taking. The promotion of tourism in this area will bring employment and boost the local economy.  We support his application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The proposal to create a centre for tourism and an energy centre is welcome.  Treherbert lacks facilities such as this that would attract businesses, tourism and inward investment to boost the local economy.  In these times of climate change, renewable energies and the reduction of carbon footprints a centre of this nature would be extremely welcome plus provide employment for the area.  Unemployed has increased significantly (an increase in RCT of 11% equating to 7,196 people) and whilst the current economic crisis continues there is little prospect of people obtaining jobs. Treherbert has been declared 33rd most deprived area in Wales (Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005), the Stelco Hardy site is vital to the area for any proposed inward investment. Under the Welsh Assembly Government Communities First Programme the remit for Communities First Partnerships over the next few years includes addressing Economic Inactivity and Child Poverty amongst other headings.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>	
<b>3387.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 919/ASN160 Former Stelco Hardy Factory						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object the use of this land for housing allocation because there is no proven need/demand for the volume of new housing stock at the top of the Rhondda Fawr. We object to this application.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Under Policy AW1 5.6 is the justification for the reduction of the allocation of houses from 14,500 new homes to the LDP requirement of 8,890 which is what we support. The need/demand for houses has not been proven the exodus of people leaving the top of the valley is more to do with the transport infrastructure than the availability of housing. There is no evidence that new houses are required at the top of the Rhondda Fawr indeed there is evidence to show that there are approximately 4000 empty properties in RCT the majority of which are in the northern area of RCT. There Mount Libanus Estate has in recent years had over 125 houses demolished as they were left derelict and there was no demand for housing.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3387.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 920/ASN161 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to the use of this land for housing allocation as the increase in housing allocation appears to be concentrated at the top of the Rhondda Fawr and at present there is no substantial evidence to show the need/demand for new housing stock.	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The site has for many years been used as community allotments and the riding school. There is still a demonstrable need for these activities within this area. The allotments have been relocated to various other sites but the riding school is still on the land as no other suitable land can be found for them to relocate.  There is no evidence to show that there is a local need for more houses, over 125 houses on the Mount Libanus Estate have been demolished in recent years and there has been no demand to rebuild at this location.  Under Policy AW1 5.6 is the justification for the reduction of the allocation of houses from 14,500 new homes to the LDP requirement of 8,890 which is what we support. The need/demand for houses has not been proven the exodus of people leaving the top of the valley is more to do with the transport infrastructure than the availability of housing.  The figures for housing allocation in the Treherbert Ward are unrealistic with a glut of empty properties at the top of the Rhondda Fawr.  Policy SSA12 makes reference by developers reusing/rehabilitating existing housing stock, this should be made a priority not building new houses where there is no evidence of need/demand.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3387.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1016/ASN163						Land at the end of Ynysfeio Avenue, Treherbert				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support the use of this land for open space, play facilities because at present pockets of land are being sold off for future housing development.  Children and adults have a right to enjoy open green spaces for leisure and play.  It is vital that future generations enjoy the natural beauty of our area and not create an urban jungle.  We support this application	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? There are possibilities for this site to be used for open space and play this would comply with LDP Policy AW7 community infrastructure which requires the provision of open space and play facilities.  There are not many pieces of land that children can partake in formal/informal play however under the Rights of the Child formal/informal play is promoted this site would be ideal for this purpose.  Under Policy AW1 5.6 is the justification for the reduction of the allocation of houses from 14,500 new homes to the LDP requirement of 8,890 which is what we support. The need/demand for houses has not been proven the exodus of people leaving the top of the valley is more to do with the transport infrastructure than the availability of housing.  There is no evidence that new houses are required at the top of the Rhonda Fawr indeed there is evidence to show that there are approximately 4000 empty properties in RCT the majority of which are in the northern area of RCT.  There Mount Libanus Estate has in recent years had over 125 houses demolished as they were left derelict and there was no demand for housing.  Access to this area for housing is very limited with access coming through Herbert Street which is an old terraced street. The increase in traffic will only congested the already well documented evidence of the bottle neck at the traffic lights at Treorchy.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3387.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:							Site: 1096/ASS016	Land at Fernhill House					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support this application for a settlement boundary change as it will take the property as a whole outside the settlement boundary. We support this application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The change to the settlement boundary would mean that the property would be wholly outside the settlement boundary. At present the settlement boundary allows for alternative planning applications to be made on land within a person's backyard which is in their ownership. There is no reason why the boundary settlement should not be moved to benefit this property.		

<b>3387.A12</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:							Site: 978/ASN165	Haigside Allotments,Rhigos Road					PEX Session:	
Policy:				Map:					Issue:					
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support the use of this land for allotments and the riding school. The land has been in use for these purposes for many years and has become a part of the communities infrastructure. The roles they play within the community although very different are quite significant within the fabric of the community. We support this application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The site has for many years been used as community allotments and the riding school. There is still a demonstrable need for these activities within this area. The allotments have been relocated to various other sites but the riding school is still on the land as no other suitable land can be found for them to relocate. In these present times of global recession your own vegetables and keeping live stock such as chickens is becoming much more important for families on tight budgets.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3387.A13</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 980/ASN166 NSA 9.15 - Old Hospital Site and School Playground						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support the use of this land for open space, play facilities and employment as currently pieces of land are being sold off for housing development. Children and adults have a right to enjoy open green spaces for leisure and play. It is vital that future generations enjoy the natural beauty in our area and not create an urban jungle. We support this application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? There are possibilities for this site to be use for open space and play this would comply with LDP Policy AW7 community infrastructure which requires the provision of open space and play facilities. There are not many pieces of land that children can partake in formal/informal play however under the Rights of the Child formal/informal play is promoted this site would be ideal for this purpose. Under Policy AW1 5.6 is the justification for the reduction of the allocation of houses from 14,500 new homes to the LDP requirement of 8,890 which is what we support. There is no evidence that new houses are required at the top of Rhondda Fawr indeed there is evidence to show that there are approximately 4000 empty properties in RCT the majority of which are in the northern area of RCT. There Mount Libanus Estate has in recent years had over 125 houses demolished as they were left derelict and there was no demand for housing.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3387.A14</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 899/ASN167						Land at Pen yr Englyn			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We support the use of this land for an extension to the Gelli/Treorchy relief road because it would alleviate the heavy traffic running through narrow valley roads and also alleviate the congestion at the traffic lights in Treorchy  We support this application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The well documented bottle neck at Treorchy traffic lights are evidence enough that there is a need for a relief road at the top of the Rhondda Valley.  The initial proposal shows the Gelli/Treorchy relief road terminating at Corner House Penyreglyn. The termination of this proposal at this junction would cause more congestion as the road is narrow and would create another bottle neck with two way traffic. Alternatively the proposed road should travel alongside the railway track, at Penyreglyn Community School the road would then ascend onto the Ynysfeio Tip along the back of the old Bryn Rhedyn Road and join the Rhigos road at Forester's house.  This would be a better use of land at Ynysfeio tip.  This construction would attract more tourists into the area as they will be able to enjoy the beautiful scenery Treherbert has to offer as opposed to being stuck in traffic jams.  This proposal would require the Rhigos Road A4061 to undergo major repairs and maintenance, the same would be the case if the road terminated at Corner House.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3387.A15</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1003/ASN171						Former Burberry Factory			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	We support this application to retain the Burberry site at Treorchy as a site for employment and industrial use. The demolition of this site would have a serious impact on the area and the opportunity for employment and the attraction of inward investment would be lost forever.	
	We support this application.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	The infrastructure for business and industrial usage is still apparent on the site. Its closure does not deter from the fact that as a community and under the Welsh Assembly Government's agenda to tackle inactivity we are working towards attracting inward investment.		
	With a mass influx of new houses the prospect of local jobs appears ludicrous. Work further down the valley or indeed outside the valley will attract local people to those areas to lay down their roots as it is their place of work.		
	It is vital to create a balance of housing and employment to create/sustain communities.		
	Since the closure of the Burberry factory the number of people unemployed has increased significantly (an increase in RCT of 11% equating to 7,196) and whilst the current economic crisis continues there is little prospect of people obtaining jobs. Treherbert has been declared 33rd most deprived area in Wales (Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005), the Burberry site is vital to the area for any proposed inward investment. Under the Welsh Assembly Government Communities First Programme the remit for Communities First Partnerships over a number of years and with the increased proposal for housing development in this area in order for people to remain within a community all prospects have to be offered from housing to leisure facilities to work locally. A community that has some form of industry attracts other benefits such as increased shopping locally, tourism and economic vibrancy.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3445.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 896/ASN070 Land rear of Bute Terrace						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Object to including in residential settlement boundary as original site assessment methodology correctly identified that the site is an important community amenity for recreation and leisure and also a SINC site. The site has also been registered as a village green by RCT Council (July 20th 2009)	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? C1, C4, CE2  P1		

<b>3445.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1077/ASS046 Land rear of Bute Terrace						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Object to including in residential settlement boundary as original site assessment methodology correctly identified that the site is an important community amenity for recreation and leisure and also a SINC site. The site has also been registered as a village green by RCT Council (July 20th 2009)	

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? C1, C4, CE2  P1		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	-------------	------	--------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	---------	----------------	----------

<b>3445.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 957/ASN071 Tower Colliery Pit Head Site						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Support proposal for tourism/heritage and leisure. Capitalise on history of Tower Colliery and preserve heritage.

<b>3445.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 958/ASN073 Land west of Mount Pleasant Inn						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
Support ecological enhancement and community use, fits well with biodiversity policies.

<b>3445.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:						
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE SHOULD BE CAREFULLY SCRUTINISED TO ENSURE COMMUNITY COHESIVENESS WITH EXISTING SETTLEMENT: CONSDERATION TO FUTURE DUALLING OF A465 AND PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3445.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 907/ASN065 Hirwaun Ironworks, North Site						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I object to this site been identified for housing. The original site assessment methodology correctly identified that it is subject to access constraints and also a SINC site. The site is also a well used recreational amenity for the immediate and wider community. The site has formally registered as a village green by RCT Council (Decision July 20th 2009) following a public inquiry heard by an independent Inspector.

Should development of this site not come forward through existing condion (Outline Planning permission ) subject to appeal / contest, this site should also not benefit from being included in the residential settlement boundary this concern waasexpressed at the last consultation but has not been taken forward to this stage of consultation - Why not?

*Item Question*

*Reply*

**Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

C1, C4, CE2, P1.

<b>3445.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 873/ASN067 Policy CS 9.2- Waste Management, Hirwaun Industri						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We question the site boundary, is it necessary to commit the whole site for waste management/recycling/renewable energy. What regard does this have to the existing employment allocation on the site and also the existing waste/renewable energy allocations throughout R.C.T.?

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3468.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1172/ASD008 SSA 10.7 - Land at Gwern Heulog, Coed Ely								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	No	
I agree with representation 566.D1, i.e. Access and egress of the site would place an increased burden on an already dangerous access point and would have a detrimental affect on the lives of existing residents.			
SSA 10.7, would form an unnecessary intrusion into the Open Countryside, in an area that has already seen a lot of development.			
By deleting SSA 10.7 it would show that the LDP is being formed via a robust and credible evidence base.			

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
By adding AS(D)8 ...SSA 10.7 to the Deletions Register, indicates that the community involvement scheme works and is adhered to by RCTCBC.			

<b>3475.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 846/ASN040 Land at Crichton Farm								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?		
I write with reference to the above mentioned LDP submission. I am instructed by to assist him in this matter. It has come to my attention that this site allocation plan is inaccurate and as a result this issue has caused some concern to local residents (Werfa Lane).			
Please note that the site plan should not include any part of the footpaths/access (Werfa Lane) which runs alongside the site and is directly adjacent to Crichton Farm.			
I attach a plan which clarifies this matter and I would be grateful if you would amend your records accordingly and confirm the site has been amended in due course.			

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3475.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 856/ASN041 Land at Crichton Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I write with reference to the above mentioned LDP submission. I am instructed by Mr. Jarvis to assist him in this matter. It has come to my attention that this site allocation plan is inaccurate and as a result this issue has caused some concern to local residents (Werfa Lane).

Please note that the site plan should not include any part of the footpaths/access (Werfa Lane) which runs alongside the site and is directly adjacent to Crichton Farm.

I attach a plan which clarifies this matter and I would be grateful if you would amend your records accordingly and confirm the site has been amended in due course.

<b>3475.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1100/ASS022 Crichton Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

I write with reference to the above mentioned LDP submission. I am instructed by Mr. Jarvis to assist him in this matter. It has come to my attention that this site allocation plan is inaccurate and as a result this issue has caused some concern to local residents (Werfa Lane).

Please note that the site plan should not include any part of the footpaths/access (Werfa Lane) which runs alongside the site and is directly adjacent to Crichton Farm.

I attach a plan which clarifies this matter and I would be grateful if you would amend your records accordingly and confirm the site has been amended in due course.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3475.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1181/ASD017 NSA 9.4 - Site including the old brickworks, old dairy and tipped land rear of Birchwood						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?										Yes		
I draw tp your attention that on 27th January 2009 following protracted and detailed negotiations, full planning permission 06/1564 was granted for the erection of 99 dwellings.														
In this case the development of the site in accordaance with the approved planning permission is assured to proceed.														
I also advise yo that a further party with a legal interest in the site is W.D.L. Homes Limited who may also make representations in this respect.														

<b>3478.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 932/ASN103 Land at Mwyndy						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

<i>Item Question</i>														<b>Representation Text</b>
1	3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?												
We currently object to the inclusion of this alternative strategic site allocation because the risks and consequences of flooding have not been demonstrated as being acceptably managed. Technical Advice Note 15 Development and Flood Risk (July 2004) also advises that the local planning authority should also provide reasoned justification for allocation of these sites.														
Section 10 of TAN15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development.														
Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new / alternative site in Zone C2 is acceptable.														
We also draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage (3478.D4) regarding the site.														

<i>Item Question</i>														<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
2	5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?													
The new / alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.															

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1014/ASN004						Former Phurnacite Plant			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>We currently object to the inclusion of this alternative strategic site allocation because the risks and consequences of flooding have not been demonstrated as being acceptably managed. Technical Advice Note 15 Development and Flood Risk (July 2004) also advises that the local planning authority should also provide reasoned justification for allocation of these sites.</p> <p>Section 10 of TAN15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development.</p> <p>Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new / alternative site in Zone C2 is acceptable.</p> <p>We also draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage (3478.D4) regarding the site.</p>

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>The new / alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.</p>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1013/ASN003 Former Phurnacite Plant						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We currently object to the inclusion of this alternative strategic site allocation because the risks and consequences of flooding have not been demonstrated as being acceptably managed. Technical Advice Note 15 Development and Flood Risk (July 2004) also advises that the local planning authority should also provide reasoned justification for allocation of these sites.

Section 10 of TAN15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development.

Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new / alternative site in Zone C2 is acceptable.

We also draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage (3478.D4) regarding the site.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The new / alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 913/ASN104 Land at Mwyndy						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>We currently object to the inclusion of this alternative strategic site allocation because the risks and consequences of flooding have not been demonstrated as being acceptably managed. Technical Advice Note 15 Development and Flood Risk (July 2004) also advises that the local planning authority should also provide reasoned justification for allocation of these sites.</p> <p>Section 10 of TAN15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development.</p> <p>Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding for the proposed new / alternative site in Zone C2 is acceptable.</p> <p>We also draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage (3478.D4) regarding the site.</p>

Item Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>The new / alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.</p>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A5</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We are concerned about the inclusion of alternative site AS (N) 64 Land at Hirwaun. We draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage (3478.D11) regarding land South of Hirwaun as a strategic site. We reiterate:  "Although we have reservations about the out-dated nature of the baseline data (sourced from our Taff LEAP - see separate representation on baseline data), in the absence of any information to the contrary, it must be considered. The SA/SEA Baseline Data Report states the sewerage systems are old and overloaded, and that premature flows from the many combined sewers cause widespread water pollution problems and aesthetic nuisance due to sewage derived debris (p. 175). In particular, a recommendation is made that development at Hirwaun and Penderyn is restricted due to the inadequate local sewerage system. The proposed allocation of land South of Hirwaun is to include: 400 dwellings, 36 hectares of employment, a new primary school, 2000m <sup>2</sup> retail store and a medical / community centre. This is in direct conflict with this recommendation and no justification for this has been provided within the Plan. As such, we believe the inclusion of this site is inappropriate, as it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and therefore we question the deliverability of these proposals".	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative residential boundary proposed should only be included where it has been proven, following agreement with Dwr Cymru / Welsh Water, that development on the scale proposed by this allocation is achievable.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A6</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1013/ASN003						Former Phurnacite Plant			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<b>Representation Text</b>
----------------------	----------------------------

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:

- AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site
- AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry
- AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry

However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.

To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:

Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.

The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.

---

<i>Item Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
----------------------	--------------	------------------------

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.

We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A7</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1014/ASN004						Former Phurnacite Plant			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:

- AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site
- AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry
- AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry

However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.

To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:

Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.

The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.

We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A8</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:

- AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site
- AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry
- AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry

However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.

To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:

Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.

The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.

We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A9</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 975/ASN064 Land at Hirwaun						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:  AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry  However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.  To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:  Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.  The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.	
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.  We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A10</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 851/ASN066						Land at Hirwaun		PEX Session:					
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

---

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

---

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:

- AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site
- AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry
- AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry

However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.

To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:

Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.

The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.

---

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.

We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A11</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 848/ASN069						Land adjacent to Rhigos Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:  AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry  However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.  To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:  Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.  The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.	
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.  We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A12</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 987/ASN085 Land to the north of Llanharry								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

**Item Question** **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:

- AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site
- AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry
- AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry

However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.

To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:

Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.

The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.

**Item Question** **Reply** **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.

We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A13</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 896/ASN070						Land rear of Bute Terrace			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:  AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry  However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.  To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:  Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.  The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.		
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.  We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A14</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	C	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1012/ASN086						Land at The Elms, Llanharry			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We do not wish to make representations of support or objection to the new / alternative sites listed below with regards to potential contamination:

- AS (N) 3: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 4: Former Phurnacite Plant
- AS (N) 26: Former Fernhill Colliery site
- AS (N) 64: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 66: Land at Hirwaun
- AS (N) 69: Land adjacent to Rhigos Road, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 85: Land to the North of Llanharry, Llanharry
- AS (N) 70: Land rear to Bute Terrace, Hirwaun
- AS (N) 86: Land at the Elms, Llanharry

However, the new / alternative sites listed above would appear to be on brownfield land, and given the former uses of these sites, it would indicate that the land may be subject to contamination. We therefore wish to draw your attention to our previous representation at the Deposit Plan stage regarding the reuse of previously developed land.

To reiterate our previous representation in regard to land affected by contamination:

Whilst in general, we support the re-use of previously developed land, we are concerned that although raised as an issue in the SA/SEA, the Deposit Plan does not properly address or consider land contamination, and the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination.

The re-development of contaminated sites can be a very costly and time consuming process, and until preliminary investigations are undertaken into the extent of contamination, no realistic estimates can be made for either the time or cost constraints involved in remediation. As a result of the scale of development being proposed on sites that could be affected by contamination, such considerations could be crucial in terms of the deliverability of the development proposals within the Plan. Your Authority should consider this further in order that an appropriate level of flexibility can be built into the Plan to deal with any unforeseen issues that may arise. In addition, we believe that an additional policy should be added to the Plan to deal with land contamination.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Should the new site be included, then the potential risks associated with the investigation and remediation of sites subject to land contamination should be included in the Plan. This may affect the deliverability of the development proposals.

We have previously requested, through our Deposit Plan representation (3478.D12), that a policy is included to cover land contamination issues.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A15</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 881/ASN120 Treforest Industrial Estate								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to the inclusion of alternative sites AS (N) 120: Treforest Industrial Estate for the following reasons:  Section 10 of TAN15 states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed for the proposed new / alternative site. The Strategic Flood Consequence Assessment (SFCA) should also assess this alternative site.  Please be aware we have been liaising with the owners of Treforest Industrial Estate (and their consultants), and we have provided advice and guidance regarding the flood risk management issues related to this alternative site. We are not currently in a position to confirm whether the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<i>Rep'n No</i>	<i>Accssn No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Modified</i>	<i>TREAT Petition of</i>	<i>EVIDENCE in parts</i>	<i>NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA</i>	<i>Repr Council</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Response</i>
<b>3478.A16</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 870/ASN119 Treforest Industrial Estate										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Representation Text</i>
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to the inclusion of alternative site AS (N) 119: Treforest Industrial Estate for the following reasons:  Section 10 of TAN15 states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that the development / use has to be there in accordance with Section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us, which demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed for the proposed new / alternative site. The Strategic Flood Consequence Assessment (SFCA) should also assess this alternative site.  Please be aware we have been liaising with the owners of Treforest Industrial Estate (and their consultants), and we have provided advice and guidance regarding the flood risk management issues in relating to the wider Estate. We are not currently in a position to confirm whether the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptable managed.	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A17</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 854/ASN114						Land at Crabtree and Evelyn				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should be allocated for highly vulnerable development.  Section 10 of TAN15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us to demonstrate that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new / alternative site in Zone C2 is acceptable.  Please be aware that we have been previously consulted regarding this site. However, the FCA produced at that time did not demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  We see further clarification from the LPA regarding how the site has been incorporated into the SFCA and assessed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A18</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 875/ASN128 Alexon Site, Cardiff Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us to demonstrate that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new/ alternative site in Zone C2 is acceptable.  We seek further clarification from the LPA regarding how this site has been incorporated into the SFCA and assessed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new/ alternative site should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.		

<b>3478.A19</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 983/ASN158 Land at Treforest Industrial Estate										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We object to the inclusion of alternative site AS (N) 158: Land at Treforest Industrial Estate, regarding the identification of a simplified planning zone.  We are of the opinion that prior to a Simplified Planning Zone being included, or identified, we would seek to resolve the flood risk issues at this site, and/or agree an approach.  Please be aware we have been liaising with the owners of Treforest Industrial Estate (and their consultants), and we have provided advice and guidance regarding the flood risk management issues related to this alternative site. We are not currently in a position to confirm whether the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptable managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The proposed identification of a simplified planning zone should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed at this site.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A20</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 861/ASN009 Site A opposite Parc Newydd Farm, Grovers										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:					Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to us to demonstrate that the consequences of flooding for the proposed new / alternative site in Zone C2 is acceptable.  We seek further clarification from the LPA regarding how this site has been incorporated into the SFCA and assessed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The proposed identification of a simplified planning zone should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A21</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1001/ASN048						Land at Garth Farm			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The alternative / new site that has been proposed for residential development does not lie within Zone C of the Development Advice Maps. However, our records show that it does lie partially within our own flood zones. There is a risk of flooding in a 1 in 100 year and 1 in 1000 year flood events.  We would therefore request that this site is assessed to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences could be acceptably managed.  We seek clarity as to how the SFCA has assessed this site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Please note, where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered by us.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A22</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 904/ASN049						Land south of Heol Iscoed			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The alternative / new site that has been proposed for residential development does not lie within Zone C of the Development Advice Maps. However, our records show that it does partially lie within our own flood zones. There is a risk of flooding in the 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year flood events.  We would therefore request that this site is assessed to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences could be acceptably managed.  We seek clarity as to how the SFCA has assessed this site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Please note, where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered by us.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A23</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1012/ASN086						Land at The Elms, Llanharry			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:			Issue:							
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The alternative / new site that has been proposed for eco-park / waste management development does not lie within Zone C of the Development Advice Maps. However, our records show that it does partially lie within our own flood zones. There is a risk of flooding in the 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year events.  We would therefore request that this site is assessed to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences could be acceptably managed.  We seek clarity as to how the SFCA has assessed this site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met.  Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Please note, where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A24</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 956/ASN033 WPD Depot						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site that has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A25</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 895/ASN173 Land at Tyle Garw						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new sites that has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A26</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 858/ASN126 Land at Halt Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A27</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 843/ASN018 Land at Gwaun Miskin						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3478.A28</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 853/ASN038 Plot 10-12 Incline Row										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A29</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 998/ASN061 Land at 43-60 Incline Row						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside of our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A30</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 886/ASN052 Ffrwd Phillip Farm						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside the DAM Zone C, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A31</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 896/ASN070						Land rear of Bute Terrace			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside the DAM Zone C, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A32</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 896/ASN070						Land rear of Bute Terrace			PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside the DAM Zone C, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A33</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 916/ASN091 Land at Heol Creigiau						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.  Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.  Where the site boundary falls outside the DAM Zone C, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3478.A34			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 1006/ASN092 Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Section 10 of TAN 15 gives specific advice on development plans. It clearly states that sites in Zone C2 should not be allocated for highly vulnerable development. The alternative / new site has been proposed for residential development lies partially within Zone C2 of the Welsh Assembly Development Advice Maps.

Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.

Where the site boundary falls outside the DAM Zone C, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.

3478.A35			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 999/ASN081 Fomer Llanharan Sewerage Treatment Works						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item Question

Representation Text

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Section 10 of TAN 15 also states that allocations should only be made in Zone C if it can be justified that a development / use has to be there in accordance with section 6 and if the consequences of locating development are acceptable, in accordance with section 7 and appendix 1. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed for the site as outlined.

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

The new / alternative settlement boundary should only be included where it has been demonstrated that test CE2 has been met. Up to date evidence must be provided to demonstrate the risks and consequences of flooding could be acceptably managed.

Where the site boundary falls outside the DAM Zone C, or our own flood zones from our Floodmap, then the requirement for a FCA would not be triggered.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3478.A36</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 864/ASN149 Land rear of Mill Street						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

We note that planning permission has been granted for AS (N) 149 by your authority. This site therefore has the benefit of planning permission and principle of development has laready been established. However, we would request a site specific FCA to be undertaken should any new, renewal or detailed application be received by us. It is perfectly reasonable for the LPA to plan for the consequences of flooding, in accordance with TAN 15

<b>3478.A37</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 901/ASN100 Henty Quarry						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

No

Our understanding is that this site was considered as part of the Site Assessment Process (site 410) and rejected. We are therefore of the opinion that alternative site AS (N) 100 should not be included in the Plan.

<b>3479.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 993/ASN013 Land at Abernant						PEX Session:							
Policy:		Map:						Issue:							
Summary:															

*Item Question*

**Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Submission of a Habitat Assessment Scoping Report.

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3479.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1166/ASD002 NSA 7 - Land at Robertstown/Abernant										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Objection has been made to the proposed deletion of Deposit Plan allocation number NSA 7.  The mixed use proposal presents an opportunity to achieve a significant regeneration scheme including residential, employment and commercial uses. It is considered that the scheme would benefit the local economy, including meeting housing needs, providing employment as well as a range of services and facilities for local people.  The allocation made under policy NSA 7 of the Deposit Plan should be retained.	Yes

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It is submitted that the site should be allocated for mixed use development under the provision of policy NSA 7 of the Deposit Plan. The proposed allocation is realistic and appropriate and its allocation would help secure a robust LDP policy base thus meeting the requirements of Coherence and Effectiveness Test CE2.  The allocation of the site would also be compatible with the provisions of National Policy set out in Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 01/2006, which seeks to secure an adequate housing land supply in locations people want to live. It is also consistent with national policy to encourage regeneration and the development of previously developed land and consequently the proposal would also meet the requirements of Consistency Test C2.		

<b>3479.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 1033/ASS011 Land at Abernant										PEX Session:		
Policy:		Map:			Issue:									
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Sustainability Appraisal submitted - M&A Wigley - Land at Abernant, Aberdare.	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3480.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Document:		Site: 923/ASN156 Land adjacent to St. Fagan's Vicarage								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

---

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? Additional information received SA/SEA and Habitat Assessment:	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3515.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 989/ASN106 Land at Parc Nantgarw						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? We consider that the site should be identified for employment/education use for the following reasons:  NLP's employment study found Parc Nantgarw to be the second best employment site in RCT<  NLP undertook an Employment Land Study on behalf of the Council in August 2008. The study concluded that Parc Nantgarw was the second best employment site in the whole of Rhondda Cynon Taff. We therefore believe that the site should be retained for employment/education use.  The site benefits from an extant planning permission for B1 use.  The landowner wishes to see the site developed for beneficial employment use.  Coleg Morgannwg propose more beneficial development at the site and in advanced discussions about purchasing the site.  Since publishing the College's Estate Strategy 2008, there has been extensive consultation and collaborative working with RCT Education and RCT Corporate Services in compiling and taking forward RCT Transformation Plan proposals for Taff Ely. The College's strategic proposal for development at Nantgarw is presented as the favourable option to subsume the RCT Transformation Olan proposals and will achieve enhanced training intrgration in Taff Ely.  The Deposit Draft is intended to take into account of the Rhondda Cynon Taff children and Young People's Plan, 2008. The plan seeks to work in partnership with agencies to achieve core aims which include having a comprehensive range of education and learning opportunities. The proposed development would fulfil this aim and we consider that the LDP should be amended, and the site allocated for employment/education use with the park and rise use deleted, to align with the strategies of key bodies and to meet the LDP objectives for learning in particular.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? The proposed change would improve the soundness of the LDP in terms of the tests of consistency (C1 and C4). Allocating te site for employment/education use would align with the Children's and Young People's Plan and the policies and plans for education providers.  More generally, we believe that an employment/education allocation will enable more beneficial development at the site. Removal of the park and ride allocation will allow the education provider to fulfil its education and property startegy and achieve its ambitions for future education provision in Rhondda Cynon Taff.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3517.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3517.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3518.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3518.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3519.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3519.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3521.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3521.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3522.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3522.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3551.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3556.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3556.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3557.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3557.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3558.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3558.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3559.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3559.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3560.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3560.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3579.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3579.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3589.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 916/ASN091 Land at Heol Creigiau						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The new road which was initially a dual carriageway is now a single carriageway. Although this improvement will alleviate traffic from the A473, it will not improve traffic congestion and access at all link roads and access to properties in this area - particularly from Crown Hill to Heol Creigiau, Efail Isaf and Chandlers Reach. Any further residential or commercial development in this area would further congest and create more serious long-term traffic and congestion problems that would be a retrograde step in terms of long term planning.</p> <p>There are many vacant office and small workshops available for small and medium enterprises located at Treforest Industrial Estate, CoedCae Lane Ind Estate and many other small commercial estates in the area. Proposed further development of retail and commercial enterprises on these proposed Alternative Sites would only benefit the developers not the Llantwit Fardre community long-term - there would be no community gain as a whole.</p> <p>It is not a Brownfield site and regeneration of residential and commercial enterprise in the area is not an issue.</p> <p>The area is in a flood plain - there is evidence of major flooding in the fields opposite our properties and from the local stream at the bottom of crown hill - detriment for emergency access and undermining.</p> <p>Walking and access to community services (public transport, trains, shops etc) is extremely adverse notwithstanding the construction of new single carriageway.</p> <p>Any further residential and/or commercial buildings in this area would create eyesores</p> <p>The land south of our property is allegedly contaminated with fly ash and other debris - some of this material has been removed by Costain to make way for constructing the new road.</p> <p>Further residential and commercial developments on these Alternative Sites would reduce agricultural land</p> <p>In terms of Environmental protection, there are several designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs Nos: 143, 136 and 137 located on the proposed Alternative Sites Nos: 92, 94 and 95. Further residential and commercial development in these areas would have adverse long-term impact on our grasslands, wild life and tree species of which we must all help to protect.</p> <p>The Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 are situated in the Valley between Llantwit Fardre and Creigiau and noise is a serious nuisance issue. The noise level from the current Construction activity is intolerable at times but as this is short-term until the road is opened we can accept this nuisance. However, we hope the traffic noise level from the new road is abated to an acceptable standard but should any further Commercial and Residential Development take place on these Alternative Sites then the noise levels will increase and become intolerable and unacceptable.</p>

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2 5				Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The objections put forward are fundamental, sensible and reasonable and above all else, by agreeing with them and rejecting the planning proposals for Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95, they will help sustain long-term benefits for Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd.</p> <p>Our reasons for making these objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Villages from Power station Hill to Cross-in shroud the A473. It is an extremely busy road and we are all aware of the traffic congestion particularly created by HGV traffic. The new road will bypass these villages (not shown on the Alternative Site maps) has no additional routes in/out of these villages. This current scenario is not going to help alleviate traffic congestion in terms of access to/from people's homes and to small and medium enterprises scattered in and among these villages.</li> <li>2. When the new road becomes operational, it is going to take up considerable area within and across the boundaries of the Alternatives Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95. Development of more Residential and more Commercial Enterprise capacity on these Sites will inevitably mirror-image the congestion of the current A473 - everybody must understand this scenario - adverse traffic congestion and limited access will inevitably develop if these Alternative Sites are developed.</li> <li>3. The lower level of Llantwit Fardre is a valley and noise from the Construction work is unacceptable but we can tolerate it for the short-term. When the new road is open traffic noise levels from the traffic will increase, should the noise levels become intolerable then RCT will have to make some sensible level of compensation. Should any further development be approved then the noise levels will increase further and no doubt there will be serious consequences.</li> <li>4. RCT Local planning have rejected the Candidate Sites for solid and sensible long-term reasons: poor access, flooding and all four Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 would be detriment to SINC sites 143, 136, 137 - why are we allowing developers to destroy woodlands and grasslands and the wild life who require these for survival - see attached RCT Planning Candidate Sites Rejection Report.</li> <li>5. To allow development on the proposed Alternative Sites would be asinine and simply a retrograde step in terms of good sensible planning. Allowing developers to cram in as many houses as they can in small areas simply adds long-term traffic congestion to our roads and limits access to amenities. In terms of commercial enterprise capacity, we should take note of how the USA plan their industrial site developments, they simply keep these developments in one area (Treforest Industrial Estate is a good example) - it makes good logistical sense to keep Commercial Enterprise away from Residential Development.</li> </ol> <p>We conclude that we are in agreement with the RCP Local Planning in rejecting these Alternative Sites: 91, 92, 94 and 95 and implore the Welsh Office Inspectorate to fully understand the long-term adverse ramifications they would impose on the residents of Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd if they overturned these Objections. One Welsh Office Inspector should not be allowed to overrule our democratic standpoint i.e., overturn the objective judgement of the RCT Planning Team and 12 or more RCT Councillors). We should be looking to develop Brown Field Sites and Sites more appropriate to provide a balanced and sustainable Environment within the Llantwit Fardre Community, not just allow Landowners and Developers to build in sensitive areas for their own gain.</p>														

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3589.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1006/ASN092						Ystrad Barwig Isaf			PEX Session:			
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The new road which was initially a dual carriageway is now a single carriageway. Although this improvement will alleviate traffic from the A473, it will not improve traffic congestion and access at all link roads and access to properties in this area - particularly from Crown Hill to Heol Creigiau, Efail Isaf and Chandlers Reach. Any further residential or commercial development in this area would further congest and create more serious long-term traffic and congestion problems that would be a retrograde step in terms of long term planning.</p> <p>There are many vacant office and small workshops available for small and medium enterprises located at Treforest Industrial Estate, CoedCae Lane Ind Estate and many other small commercial estates in the area. Proposed further development of retail and commercial enterprises on these proposed Alternative Sites would only benefit the developers not the Llantwit Fardre community long-term - there would be no community gain as a whole.</p> <p>It is not a Brownfield site and regeneration of residential and commercial enterprise in the area is not an issue.</p> <p>The area is in a flood plain - there is evidence of major flooding in the fields opposite our properties and from the local stream at the bottom of crown hill - detriment for emergency access and undermining.</p> <p>Walking and access to community services (public transport, trains, shops etc) is extremely adverse notwithstanding the construction of new single carriageway.</p> <p>Any further residential and/or commercial buildings in this area would create eyesores</p> <p>The land south of our property is allegedly contaminated with fly ash and other debris - some of this material has been removed by Costain to make way for constructing the new road.</p> <p>Further residential and commercial developments on these Alternative Sites would reduce agricultural land</p> <p>In terms of Environmental protection, there are several designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs Nos: 143, 136 and 137 located on the proposed Alternative Sites Nos: 92, 94 and 95. Further residential and commercial development in these areas would have adverse long-term impact on our grasslands, wild life and tree species of which we must all help to protect.</p> <p>The Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 are situated in the Valley between Llantwit Fardre and Creigiau and noise is a serious nuisance issue. The noise level from the current Construction activity is intolerable at times but as this is short-term until the road is opened we can accept this nuisance. However, we hope the traffic noise level from the new road is abated to an acceptable standard but should any further Commercial and Residential Development take place on these Alternative Sites then the noise levels will increase and become intolerable and unacceptable.</p>	

Item Question Reply Soundness Tests

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2 5				Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The objections put forward are fundamental, sensible and reasonable and above all else, by agreeing with them and rejecting the planning proposals for Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95, they will help sustain long-term benefits for Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd.</p> <p>Our reasons for making these objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Villages from Power station Hill to Cross-in shroud the A473. It is an extremely busy road and we are all aware of the traffic congestion particularly created by HGV traffic. The new road will bypass these villages (not shown on the Alternative Site maps) has no additional routes in/out of these villages. This current scenario is not going to help alleviate traffic congestion in terms of access to/from people's homes and to small and medium enterprises scattered in and among these villages.</li> <li>2. When the new road becomes operational, it is going to take up considerable area within and across the boundaries of the Alternatives Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95. Development of more Residential and more Commercial Enterprise capacity on these Sites will inevitably mirror-image the congestion of the current A473 - everybody must understand this scenario - adverse traffic congestion and limited access will inevitably develop if these Alternative Sites are developed.</li> <li>3. The lower level of Llantwit Fardre is a valley and noise from the Construction work is unacceptable but we can tolerate it for the short-term. When the new road is open traffic noise levels from the traffic will increase, should the noise levels become intolerable then RCT will have to make some sensible level of compensation. Should any further development be approved then the noise levels will increase further and no doubt there will be serious consequences.</li> <li>4. RCT Local planning have rejected the Candidate Sites for solid and sensible long-term reasons: poor access, flooding and all four Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 would be detriment to SINC sites 143, 136, 137 - why are we allowing developers to destroy woodlands and grasslands and the wild life who require these for survival - see attached RCT Planning Candidate Sites Rejection Report.</li> <li>5. To allow development on the proposed Alternative Sites would be asinine and simply a retrograde step in terms of good sensible planning. Allowing developers to cram in as many houses as they can in small areas simply adds long-term traffic congestion to our roads and limits access to amenities. In terms of commercial enterprise capacity, we should take note of how the USA plan their industrial site developments, they simply keep these developments in one area (Treforest Industrial Estate is a good example) - it makes good logistical sense to keep Commercial Enterprise away from Residential Development.</li> </ol> <p>We conclude that we are in agreement with the RCP Local Planning in rejecting these Alternative Sites: 91, 92, 94 and 95 and implore the Welsh Office Inspectorate to fully understand the long-term adverse ramifications they would impose on the residents of Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd if they overturned these Objections. One Welsh Office Inspector should not be allowed to overrule our democratic standpoint i.e., overturn the objective judgement of the RCT Planning Team and 12 or more RCT Councillors). We should be looking to develop Brown Field Sites and Sites more appropriate to provide a balanced and sustainable Environment within the Llantwit Fardre Community, not just allow Landowners and Developers to build in sensitive areas for their own gain.</p>														



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3589.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 911/ASN094 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The new road which was initially a dual carriageway is now a single carriageway. Although this improvement will alleviate traffic from the A473, it will not improve traffic congestion and access at all link roads and access to properties in this area - particularly from Crown Hill to Heol Creigiau, Efail Isaf and Chandlers Reach. Any further residential or commercial development in this area would further congest and create more serious long-term traffic and congestion problems that would be a retrograde step in terms of long term planning.</p> <p>There are many vacant office and small workshops available for small and medium enterprises located at Treforest Industrial Estate, CoedCae Lane Ind Estate and many other small commercial estates in the area. Proposed further development of retail and commercial enterprises on these proposed Alternative Sites would only benefit the developers not the Llantwit Fardre community long-term - there would be no community gain as a whole.</p> <p>It is not a Brownfield site and regeneration of residential and commercial enterprise in the area is not an issue.</p> <p>The area is in a flood plain - there is evidence of major flooding in the fields opposite our properties and from the local stream at the bottom of crown hill - detriment for emergency access and undermining.</p> <p>Walking and access to community services (public transport, trains, shops etc) is extremely adverse notwithstanding the construction of new single carriageway.</p> <p>Any further residential and/or commercial buildings in this area would create eyesores</p> <p>The land south of our property is allegedly contaminated with fly ash and other debris - some of this material has been removed by Costain to make way for constructing the new road.</p> <p>Further residential and commercial developments on these Alternative Sites would reduce agricultural land</p> <p>In terms of Environmental protection, there are several designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs Nos: 143, 136 and 137 located on the proposed Alternative Sites Nos: 92, 94 and 95. Further residential and commercial development in these areas would have adverse long-term impact on our grasslands, wild life and tree species of which we must all help to protect.</p> <p>The Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 are situated in the Valley between Llantwit Fardre and Creigiau and noise is a serious nuisance issue. The noise level from the current Construction activity is intolerable at times but as this is short-term until the road is opened we can accept this nuisance. However, we hope the traffic noise level from the new road is abated to an acceptable standard but should any further Commercial and Residential Development take place on these Alternative Sites then the noise levels will increase and become intolerable and unacceptable.</p>

Item Question

Reply

Soundness Tests

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2 5				Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The objections put forward are fundamental, sensible and reasonable and above all else, by agreeing with them and rejecting the planning proposals for Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95, they will help sustain long-term benefits for Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd.</p> <p>Our reasons for making these objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Villages from Power station Hill to Cross-in shroud the A473. It is an extremely busy road and we are all aware of the traffic congestion particularly created by HGV traffic. The new road will bypass these villages (not shown on the Alternative Site maps) has no additional routes in/out of these villages. This current scenario is not going to help alleviate traffic congestion in terms of access to/from people's homes and to small and medium enterprises scattered in and among these villages.</li> <li>2. When the new road becomes operational, it is going to take up considerable area within and across the boundaries of the Alternatives Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95. Development of more Residential and more Commercial Enterprise capacity on these Sites will inevitably mirror-image the congestion of the current A473 - everybody must understand this scenario - adverse traffic congestion and limited access will inevitably develop if these Alternative Sites are developed.</li> <li>3. The lower level of Llantwit Fardre is a valley and noise from the Construction work is unacceptable but we can tolerate it for the short-term. When the new road is open traffic noise levels from the traffic will increase, should the noise levels become intolerable then RCT will have to make some sensible level of compensation. Should any further development be approved then the noise levels will increase further and no doubt there will be serious consequences.</li> <li>4. RCT Local planning have rejected the Candidate Sites for solid and sensible long-term reasons: poor access, flooding and all four Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 would be detriment to SINC sites 143, 136, 137 - why are we allowing developers to destroy woodlands and grasslands and the wild life who require these for survival - see attached RCT Planning Candidate Sites Rejection Report.</li> <li>5. To allow development on the proposed Alternative Sites would be asinine and simply a retrograde step in terms of good sensible planning. Allowing developers to cram in as many houses as they can in small areas simply adds long-term traffic congestion to our roads and limits access to amenities. In terms of commercial enterprise capacity, we should take note of how the USA plan their industrial site developments, they simply keep these developments in one area (Treforest Industrial Estate is a good example) - it makes good logistical sense to keep Commercial Enterprise away from Residential Development.</li> </ol> <p>We conclude that we are in agreement with the RCP Local Planning in rejecting these Alternative Sites: 91, 92, 94 and 95 and implore the Welsh Office Inspectorate to fully understand the long-term adverse ramifications they would impose on the residents of Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd if they overturned these Objections. One Welsh Office Inspector should not be allowed to overrule our democratic standpoint i.e., overturn the objective judgement of the RCT Planning Team and 12 or more RCT Councillors). We should be looking to develop Brown Field Sites and Sites more appropriate to provide a balanced and sustainable Environment within the Llantwit Fardre Community, not just allow Landowners and Developers to build in sensitive areas for their own gain.</p>														

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3589.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 910/ASN095 Land at Ystrad Barwig Isaf						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The new road which was initially a dual carriageway is now a single carriageway. Although this improvement will alleviate traffic from the A473, it will not improve traffic congestion and access at all link roads and access to properties in this area - particularly from Crown Hill to Heol Creigiau, Efail Isaf and Chandlers Reach. Any further residential or commercial development in this area would further congest and create more serious long-term traffic and congestion problems that would be a retrograde step in terms of long term planning.</p> <p>There are many vacant office and small workshops available for small and medium enterprises located at Treforest Industrial Estate, CoedCae Lane Ind Estate and many other small commercial estates in the area. Proposed further development of retail and commercial enterprises on these proposed Alternative Sites would only benefit the developers not the Llantwit Fardre community long-term - there would be no community gain as a whole.</p> <p>It is not a Brownfield site and regeneration of residential and commercial enterprise in the area is not an issue.</p> <p>The area is in a flood plain - there is evidence of major flooding in the fields opposite our properties and from the local stream at the bottom of crown hill - detriment for emergency access and undermining.</p> <p>Walking and access to community services (public transport, trains, shops etc) is extremely adverse notwithstanding the construction of new single carriageway.</p> <p>Any further residential and/or commercial buildings in this area would create eyesores</p> <p>The land south of our property is allegedly contaminated with fly ash and other debris - some of this material has been removed by Costain to make way for constructing the new road.</p> <p>Further residential and commercial developments on these Alternative Sites would reduce agricultural land</p> <p>In terms of Environmental protection, there are several designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs Nos: 143, 136 and 137 located on the proposed Alternative Sites Nos: 92, 94 and 95. Further residential and commercial development in these areas would have adverse long-term impact on our grasslands, wild life and tree species of which we must all help to protect.</p> <p>The Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 are situated in the Valley between Llantwit Fardre and Creigiau and noise is a serious nuisance issue. The noise level from the current Construction activity is intolerable at times but as this is short-term until the road is opened we can accept this nuisance. However, we hope the traffic noise level from the new road is abated to an acceptable standard but should any further Commercial and Residential Development take place on these Alternative Sites then the noise levels will increase and become intolerable and unacceptable.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
------	----------	-------	-----------------

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
2	5			Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?										
<p>The objections put forward are fundamental, sensible and reasonable and above all else, by agreeing with them and rejecting the planning proposals for Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95, they will help sustain long-term benefits for Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd.</p> <p>Our reasons for making these objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Villages from Power station Hill to Cross-in shroud the A473. It is an extremely busy road and we are all aware of the traffic congestion particularly created by HGV traffic. The new road will bypass these villages (not shown on the Alternative Site maps) has no additional routes in/out of these villages. This current scenario is not going to help alleviate traffic congestion in terms of access to/from people's homes and to small and medium enterprises scattered in and among these villages.</li> <li>2. When the new road becomes operational, it is going to take up considerable area within and across the boundaries of the Alternatives Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95. Development of more Residential and more Commercial Enterprise capacity on these Sites will inevitably mirror-image the congestion of the current A473 - everybody must understand this scenario - adverse traffic congestion and limited access will inevitably develop if these Alternative Sites are developed.</li> <li>3. The lower level of Llantwit Fardre is a valley and noise from the Construction work is unacceptable but we can tolerate it for the short-term. When the new road is open traffic noise levels from the traffic will increase, should the noise levels become intolerable then RCT will have to make some sensible level of compensation. Should any further development be approved then the noise levels will increase further and no doubt there will be serious consequences.</li> <li>4. RCT Local planning have rejected the Candidate Sites for solid and sensible long-term reasons: poor access, flooding and all four Alternative Sites 91, 92, 94 and 95 would be detriment to SINC sites 143, 136, 137 - why are we allowing developers to destroy woodlands and grasslands and the wild life who require these for survival - see attached RCT Planning Candidate Sites Rejection Report.</li> <li>5. To allow development on the proposed Alternative Sites would be asinine and simply a retrograde step in terms of good sensible planning. Allowing developers to cram in as many houses as they can in small areas simply adds long-term traffic congestion to our roads and limits access to amenities. In terms of commercial enterprise capacity, we should take note of how the USA plan their industrial site developments, they simply keep these developments in one area (Treforest Industrial Estate is a good example) - it makes good logistical sense to keep Commercial Enterprise away from Residential Development.</li> </ol> <p>We conclude that we are in agreement with the RCP Local Planning in rejecting these Alternative Sites: 91, 92, 94 and 95 and implore the Welsh Office Inspectorate to fully understand the long-term adverse ramifications they would impose on the residents of Llantwit Fardre, Pontypridd if they overturned these Objections. One Welsh Office Inspector should not be allowed to overrule our democratic standpoint i.e., overturn the objective judgement of the RCT Planning Team and 12 or more RCT Councillors). We should be looking to develop Brown Field Sites and Sites more appropriate to provide a balanced and sustainable Environment within the Llantwit Fardre Community, not just allow Landowners and Developers to build in sensitive areas for their own gain.</p>														

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3595.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Document: Site: 895/ASN173 Land at Tyle Garw PEX Session:  
 Policy: Map: Issue:  
 Summary:

*Item Question* **Representation Text**

1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
 I object to the inclusion of the above site in the RCT Local Development Plan on the grounds of the loss of a non replaceable amenity for the local and neighbouring communities. This woodland provides an amenity which is currently very heavily used and valued by the current community. This resource will become more valuable (in amenity terms) as other local residential schemes become developed and the site of the Local Community increased.  
 I would consider it to be an act of folly to include this land in the plan, as conversion to residential status would take away the very resource an increasing population requires for recreational and amenity use.

*Item Question* **Soundness Tests**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  
 By not including this site in the plan you will be seen to have considered and valued the need for "natural" amenity space in the overall viability of 2021 plan, without the presentation of such amenity the plan would be unsustainable and open to ridicule for being such.

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3597.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3597.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3598.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3598.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3599.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3599.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3600.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3600.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3601.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3601.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3602.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3602.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3602.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3602.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3603.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3603.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3604.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3604.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3604.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3604.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3605.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3605.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3606.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3606.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3606.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3606.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3607.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3607.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3608.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3608.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3609.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3609.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3609.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3609.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3610.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3610.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3611.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3611.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3611.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3611.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3612.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3612.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3613.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3613.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3614.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3614.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3614.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3614.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3615.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3615.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3615.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3615.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3616.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3616.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
	1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.		
	2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing		
	3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.		
	4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.		
	5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.		
	6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3616.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3616.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3617.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3617.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3618.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3618.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3619.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3619.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3620.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3620.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3621.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3621.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3622.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3622.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3623.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3623.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3624.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3624.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3625.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3625.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3626.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3626.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3627.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3627.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3628.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3628.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3629.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3629.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3630.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3630.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3631.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3631.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3632.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3632.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3633.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3633.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3634.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3634.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3635.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3635.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3636.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3636.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3637.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3637.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3638.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3638.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3639.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3639.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3641.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3641.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3642.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3642.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3643.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3643.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3644.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3644.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3645.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3645.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3646.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3646.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3647.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3647.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3648.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3648.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3650.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3650.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3652.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3652.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3653.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3653.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3655.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3655.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3656.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3656.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3657.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3657.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3658.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3658.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3659.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3659.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3660.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3660.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3661.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3661.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3662.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3663.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3663.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3664.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3664.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3665.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3665.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3666.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3667.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3668.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3668.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3669.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3669.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3670.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3671.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3671.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3672.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3672.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3673.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3673.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3674.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3674.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3675.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3675.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3676.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3676.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3677.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road						PEX Session:						
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3677.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3677.A3</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3677.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3678.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3678.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3679.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3679.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3680.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3680.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3681.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ul>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3681.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3681.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3681.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3682.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3682.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3683.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3683.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3684.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan. 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access. 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts. 5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park. 6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3684.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3684.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3684.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3685.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3685.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3686.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3686.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3687.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</li> <li>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</li> <li>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</li> <li>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</li> <li>5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</li> <li>6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.</li> </ol>	

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3687.A2</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 1026/ASS017						Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road				PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhondda road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site. The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area. The only access to the site joins Clyn Gwyn Road near the bottom of the hill and is far too narrow for an estate access, the land included in the north west of the site is contested and not available for an alternative access. The junction of this road with Blaenrhondda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhondda. Several accidents, one with a child was fatal, have occurred here and near misses are frequently reported so any increase in traffic congestion will exacerbate an existing situation. The Special Landscape Area, 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' encompasses this area, the allotments are hidden from view behind houses in Blaenrhondda Road. These proposed houses in their elevated position would be clearly visible against the backdrop of Penpych Park and right across the valley.  Taking into consideration the above points, I strongly object to the site 'AS(N)24 Rear of Blaenrhondda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.		
	1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.		
	2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing		
	3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.		
	4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.		
	5) The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.		
	6) Removing this section from the Special Landscape Area under Policy NSA25-7 will contravene its description 'Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes' and spoil the continuity of the SLA.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3687.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3687.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3688.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3688.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3689.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3689.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3690.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3690.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3691.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1	3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2	5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3691.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3692.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3692.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3692.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 920/ASN161 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? For 2 reasons I object to the use of the Haigside allotments (ref. land off Rhigos Road) for residential purposes.  1. Residents of Abertonllwyd Street, Treherbert have constantly complained about the problem of large articulated vehicles causing their house foundations to shake as the vehicles leave and join the Rhigos Road, A4061, to begin or end their journeys through the Rhondda Valley. MP, AMP and local councillors have expressed concern, but despite their help no progress have been made. The number of large vehicles pounding up and down Abertonllwyd Street for a year or more during construction will be greatly increased if 150 new houses are built on the allotment site. Residents of Abertonllwyd Street have over the last 10 years complained bitterly to the local authority, regarding traffic vibration being experienced throughout their properties, and are concerned that should this development go forward it will result in even more vibration and sleep disturbance which will be on going until such times as the problem is addressed and rectified.  2. There is no evidence to show that there is a local need for new affordable housing in Treherbert. Indeed, over 100 social houses have been demolished on the Mount Libanus Estate and the land there has been left empty for a number of years. New affordable houses have not been rebuilt there because  (a) There are approximately 4000 empty properties in RCT, the majority of which are in the heads of the Rhondda Valleys. (b) Old valley houses are more substantial in size than new affordable houses and are cheaper to buy and rent.  In fact Policy SSA 12 makes reference to the fact that developers of small private sites would be expected to contribute to the reuse/ rehabilitation of existing older housing stock and that this should be given priority instead of building their quota of 25% affordable.  This land should be used for allotment - related activities and educational activities given the present climate. The latter would provide employment and contribute to the local economy.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Q5 CE2. 150 houses to be built on small site, land at Rhigos Road. 50 houses to be built on NSA 9.15. 150 houses to be build on NSA 9.16.  These figures are unrealistic and are far far far in excess of the allocation for Treherbert Ward, when there is already a surplus of empty properties and no proven need for affordable.  CE4 The plan is not reasonably flexible to deal with a possibility of using the site for educational purposes (under the Energy umbrella) which could provide employment, and help the local economy. Using the site also for allotment-related activities (also energy-related) would make the LDP even more robust since it will improve the health of the population via exercise and better diet.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
<b>3692.A4</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 899/ASN167 Land at Pen yr Englyn						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I support the alternative proposal AS(N)167 regarding the Northern extension of the Gelli-Treorci relief road.  It should be built alongside, NOT ON, the existing rail service track bed. (As in the Development Plan's CS8.a2 site 725 proposal.)  It should cross the valley just south of New Penyreglyn school, continuing over the empty Ynysfeio top (re-graded) and then northward above the Penyreglyn urban settlement boundary and any equestrian grazings. This allows it to join the A4061 Rhigos mountain road just northern of the "Forestry House" bend. (A roundabout intersection.)  Currently, articulated and other heavy vehicles which use the A4061 as a link with the inter-city A465, thunder through Abertonllwyd Street and Bute Street Treherbert and onto the "Carmel Narrows" in Penyreglyn. The concern about the intolerable vibration these vehicles are causing throughout Abertonllwyd Street, along with sleep disturbance, has been made plain to the Highways Department. The proposed re-alignment of A4061 would greatly ameliorate this problem.  Using part of Ynysfeio tip to route the relief road above Penyreglyn does NOT conflict with alternative proposals AS(N)162 and 163, reserving it for leisure and recreation. It is a large enough area to accommodate both functions. (As is the case alongside the new road to Clydach Pavilions.) The tip should NOT be reserved for development of 150 houses, as Development Plan Policy No. NSA9.16 states. There is a surplus of vacant properties in the Ward. We have precious little open land for safe recreational activity as it is, particularly sporting facilities and play areas. (See LDP Policy AW7)	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CE2  This alternative, AS(N)167 is a more appropriate strategy for the Ward, and would make the Development Plan more robust therefore. We need to retain a full rail service all the way to Treherbert Station (and even to Tyneydd). The existing streets immediately south of the Rhigos mountain road cannot take their present hammering, indefinitely. This alternative relief road route would make it a far easier journey for those having and seeking work westwards and eastwards along the A465 Heads of the Valleys axis, instead of the original LDP Policy, CS8a2 site 725, terminating the road at the Carmel Narrows in Penyreglyn.  CE4  The original LDP proposal (CS8.a2 site 725) is too inflexible to deal with changing circumstances. A particular example is the need for an easy journey-to-work when in the future, the jobs will eventually begin to appear to the north of us, when the A465 becomes dual carriageway along its entirety.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3693.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3693.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3693.A3			<input type="checkbox"/>	O	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 920/ASN161 Land at Rhigos Road						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? For 2 reasons I object to the use of the Haigside allotments (ref. land off Rhigos Road) for residential purposes.  1. Residents of Abertonllwyd Street, Treherbert have constantly complained about the problem of large articulated vehicles causing their house foundations to shake as the vehicles leave and join the Rhigos Road, A4061, to begin or end their journeys through the Rhondda Valley. MP, AMP and local councillors have expressed concern, but despite their help no progress have been made. The number of large vehicles pounding up and down Abertonllwyd Street for a year or more during construction will be greatly increased if 150 new houses are built on the allotment site. Residents of Abertonllwyd Street have over the last 10 years complained bitterly to the local authority, regarding traffic vibration being experienced throughout their properties, and are concerned that should this development go forward it will result in even more vibration and sleep disturbance which will be on going until such times as the problem is addressed and rectified.  2. There is no evidence to show that there is a local need for new affordable housing in Treherbert. Indeed, over 100 social houses have been demolished on the Mount Libanus Estate and the land there has been left empty for a number of years. New affordable houses have not been rebuilt there because  (a) There are approximately 4000 empty properties in RCT, the majority of which are in the heads of the Rhondda Valleys. (b) Old valley houses are more substantial in size than new affordable houses and are cheaper to buy and rent.  In fact Policy SSA 12 makes reference to the fact that developers of small private sites would be expected to contribute to the reuse/ rehabilitation of existing older housing stock and that this should be given priority instead of building their quota of 25% affordable.  This land should be used for allotment - related activities and educational activities given the present climate. The latter would provide employment and contribute to the local economy.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? Q5 CE2. 150 houses to be built on small site, land at Rhigos Road. 50 houses to be built on NSA 9.15. 150 houses to be build on NSA 9.16.  These figures are unrealistic and are far far far in excess of the allocation for Treherbert Ward, when there is already a surplus of empty properties and no proven need for affordable.  CE4 The plan is not reasonably flexible to deal with a possibility of using the site for educational purposes (under the Energy umbrella) which could provide employment, and help the local economy. Using the site also for allotment-related activities (also energy-related) would make the LDP even more robust since it will improve the health of the population via exercise and better diet.		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response	
3693.A4			<input type="checkbox"/>	S	W	M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Document:		Site: 899/ASN167 Land at Pen yr Englyn						PEX Session:							
Policy:				Map:				Issue:							
Summary:															

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? I support the alternative proposal AS(N)167 regarding the Northern extension of the Gelli-Treorci relief road.  It should be built alongside, NOT ON, the existing rail service track bed. (As in the Development Plan's CS8.a2 site 725 proposal.)  It should cross the valley just south of New Penyreglyn school, continuing over the empty Ynysfeio top (re-graded) and then northward above the Penyreglyn urban settlement boundary and any equestrian grazings. This allows it to join the A4061 Rhigos mountain road just northern of the "Forestry House" bend. (A roundabout intersection.)  Currently, articulated and other heavy vehicles which use the A4061 as a link with the inter-city A465, thunder through Abertonllwyd Street and Bute Street Treherbert and onto the "Carmel Narrows" in Penyreglyn. The concern about the intolerable vibration these vehicles are causing throughout Abertonllwyd Street, along with sleep disturbance, has been made plain to the Highways Department. The proposed re-alignment of A4061 would greatly ameliorate this problem.  Using part of Ynysfeio tip to route the relief road above Penyreglyn does NOT conflict with alternative proposals AS(N)162 and 163, reserving it for leisure and recreation. It is a large enough area to accommodate both functions. (As is the case alongside the new road to Clydach Pavilions.) The tip should NOT be reserved for development of 150 houses, as Development Plan Policy No. NSA9.16 states. There is a surplus of vacant properties in the Ward. We have precious little open land for safe recreational activity as it is, particularly sporting facilities and play areas. (See LDP Policy AW7)	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? CE2  This alternative, AS(N)167 is a more appropriate strategy for the Ward, and would make the Development Plan more robust therefore. We need to retain a full rail service all the way to Treherbert Station (and even to Tyneydd). The existing streets immediately south of the Rhigos mountain road cannot take their present hammering, indefinitely. This alternative relief road route would make it a far easier journey for those having and seeking work westwards and eastwards along the A465 Heads of the Valleys axis, instead of the original LDP Policy, CS8a2 site 725, terminating the road at the Carmel Narrows in Penyreglyn.  CE4  The original LDP proposal (CS8.a2 site 725) is too inflexible to deal with changing circumstances. A particular example is the need for an easy journey-to-work when in the future, the jobs will eventually begin to appear to the north of us, when the A465 becomes dual carriageway along its entirety.		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3694.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3694.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3695.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3695.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3696.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3696.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3697.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3697.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3698.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3698.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3699.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3699.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3700.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3700.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3701.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3701.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3702.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3702.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3704.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3704.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3705.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3705.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
<b>3706.A1</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3706.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3707.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register. Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting. Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail. The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads. The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery. This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail. I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity. Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area. This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.		



Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3707.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3708.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3708.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3709.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3709.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it.</p> <p>The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief.</p> <p>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</p> <p>The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind.</p> <p>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</p> <p>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>		

REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3710.A1			<input type="checkbox"/>	S		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)										PEX Session:		
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	
	<p>This site was submitted as an alternative use for the Strategic Site covered by policy NSA 5 under the category Tourism and Leisure as shown by the correction on page 7 of the Introduction to the Alternative Site Register.</p> <p>Its proposal as a Country Park, exploits its only viable use, which is the conclusion of the Urban Capacity Study. Its design was carefully chosen to satisfy the Sustainability criteria and the need for Land Reclamation kept to a minimum using the natural features of the wonderful landscape to preserve the tranquil setting.</p> <p>Being the last valley to have this feature incorporated at its head, we are able to design out the mistakes we found in other similar venues. We have provided for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders, giving each a dedicated pathway to join the Coed Morgannwg Way and the Celtic Trail.</p> <p>The proposed generation of electricity from the water flowing through the valley and other measures and the use of electric powered vehicles to ferry tourists from car parking areas, enforces the climatic change policy and prevents further congestion on the over subscribed A4061 and valley roads.</p> <p>The scheme could easily be expanded at a future date to provide Tourist Accommodation for Educational, Historic and Archaeological pursuits and the Cafeteria a welcomed resting place to just sit and enjoy the scenery.</p> <p>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</p> <p>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>	

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?		
	<p>This alternative proposal, which has yet to be assessed, is the most viable option for the Strategic site covered by policy NSA 5 The Former Fernhill Colliery Site. It satisfies most if not all of the sustainability criteria and would bring prosperity to the upper Rhondda Fawr. The housing allocations within this area are vastly over subscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</p> <p>Its inclusion as Tourism and Leisure in the form of a Country Park would make the LDP much more robust, provide Employment and bringing extra Revenue into the area.</p> <p>This scheme is supported by the evidence contained in the Urban Capacity Study and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal and protects the Special Landscape Area and the SINC (Treherbert slopes), which surround the area while providing a diverse habitat for the protected species present.</p>		

Filtered to show: (All representations)

Rep'n No	Accssn No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source Type	Mode	Status	Modified	TREAT Petition of	EVIDENCE in parts	NO FRTHR EVID. Add'l SA/SEA	Repr Council	Officer	Recommendation	Response
3710.A2			<input type="checkbox"/>	O		M			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Document:		Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)								PEX Session:				
Policy:				Map:				Issue:						
Summary:														

Item	Question	Representation Text
1 3 - 4	Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?	<p>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</p>

Item	Question	Reply	Soundness Tests
2 5	Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?	<p>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</li> <li>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</li> <li>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</li> <li>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</li> <li>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</li> <li>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</li> <li>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</li> </ol>	