Representation No 3711.A1

Policy:
Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

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

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 affordable, 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 Text

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representative Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3712.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Site:** 871/ASN023  
  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

- **Map:**

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**

1. **Soundness Tests**

1. **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.

2. **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.
Representations and Responses

**Item Question**

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

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.

---

**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 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 to 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.
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.

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 | **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.
   Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2 | **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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Treat Petition of Evidence</th>
<th>No Further Evidence</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3713.A3</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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.

**Item Question**

1. 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 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 to 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.
**Item Question**: 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**: 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 by: Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

### Item Question

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. **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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3715.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

1. 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.

2. 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3716.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
### Item Question

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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.

2. **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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accessn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Treat Petition of Evid. in parts</th>
<th>Add'l No FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue: PEX Session:

**Item Question**

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**

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.
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**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023

Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

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 Morgenwag 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.

---

**Reply**

---

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question**

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 SSAT 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 SSAT 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question 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 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 affordable, 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 Text

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.

Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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)3, has yet to be considered.
### Item Question

1. **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.

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FR/HR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3720.A2</td>
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<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Site:** 883/ASN026  
  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Map:**

- Policy: Site

**Policy:**

- Map: Site

**Summary:**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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.

2. **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 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 to 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’ ASN/23, has yet to be considered.

---

12/11/2009  
Page 819 of  2323
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.
Representation Text

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 SSASF 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.

Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**  
by: Representation No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Add’l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>No FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3722.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- Map: Site: 871/ASN023  
- Policy: Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**

1. **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.

2. **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

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3722.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Document:
- **Map:** Policy:
- **Site:** 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

#### Policy:
- **Item Question**
- **Representation Text**

**Summary:**

**Issue:**
- Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text:**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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.

#### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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

- 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.

### Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

<table>
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<tr>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

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.

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 affordable, 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)
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**Document:**

Map: 

Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

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

**Representation Text**

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.

**Item Question**

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Reply**

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.
2. It is not based 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 to 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.
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<tr>
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Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)
Policy: Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Item Question: 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: 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 affordable, 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.

12/11/2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 SSAFE 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Morgenwg 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Acssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
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**Document:**
- **Map:** Policy: Site 883/ASN026
- **Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

1. **Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Item Question**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

   1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

2. **Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?**

   It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

   1. It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.
   2. It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.
   3. It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.
   4. It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.
   5. It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.

12/11/2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
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**Document: Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

- 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.

- 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 afforables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.

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 Text**

**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. **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 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 to 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.

---

1/12/2009 Page 835 of 2323
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 affordable, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)S3, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question

**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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**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 affordable's, 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 Text**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/11/2009
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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

---

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.
**Item Question**

1. 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**

2. 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.
**Issue:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 afforables, 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. |
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
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.

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 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 to 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.
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Document: Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue:

PEX Session:

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.

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 Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 5 | It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that: 
| 1 | It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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. 
<p>| 7 | A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)3, has yet to be considered. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3736.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:** Issue: PEX Session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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 affordable housing. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question

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

   - 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.

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 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 to 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.

### Soundness Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3737.A1

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue:

Soundness Tests

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, enforce 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.

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 affordability, 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3738.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:** Issue:

---

**Item Question**

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

- **Representative Text:**

  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.

  Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Item Question**

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

- **Representative Text:**

  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 affordable, 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.
### Item Question

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

   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 SSASF 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.

2. **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 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 to 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.
### Item Question 1
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 2
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? 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 SSASF 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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 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 to 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 sace as the vehicles leave and join the Rhigos Road, A4061, to being 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 ongoing 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 built 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.

Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

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 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.
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 Penyrenglyn school, continuing over the empty Ynysfeio top (re-graded) and then northward above the Penyrenglyn 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 Penyrenglyn. 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 Penyrenglyn 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)

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 Penyrenglyn.

The original LDP proposal (CS8a2 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.
1. 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.

2. 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.
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.

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Representative Details

**Representation No:**

- **Petition of Representation:**
  - **In parts:**
  - **Addl:**
  - **SA/SEA:**
  - **Repr Council:**
  - **Officer:**
  - **Recommendation:**
  - **Response:**

**Policy:**

- **Map:**
- **Site:** 871/ASN023
- **Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
- **PEX Session:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reply:**

- **12/11/2009 Page 862 of 2323**
Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3741.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document:

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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.

**Item Question**

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

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 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 to 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.

12/11/2009  Page 863 of 2323
### Rep'n No 3742.A1

**Document:**
- Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
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 1 (3-4)**
- **Representation Text:**

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 2 (5)**
- **Representation Text:**

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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3743.A1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:**
- **Site:** 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

Item Question

1. **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**

2. **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.
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.

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 afforables 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.
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.

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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
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. Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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.
## Summary:

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 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.

### Soundness Tests

1. **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.

2. **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.
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.

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.
### Item Question

1. 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.

### Soundness Tests

2. 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 affordability, 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.
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Document: Map: Policy: Site: Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soundness Tests:

<p>| 1 | It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence in Parts</th>
<th>Additional</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep'n Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3746.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  
**Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

- 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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

- **Soundness Tests**

  **Representative 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.

   - Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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.
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**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

Item Question: 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 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 to 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 Text

**Proposal**: Petition of Representation No 3747.A1

**Document**: Map: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary**: 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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. **Item Question**: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
   
   **Reply**: 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 affrodables 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.
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.

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.
In the year 2009, Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan, Document: Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

### Summary:

**Issue:**

1. 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.

2. 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

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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.

### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan
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Document: Map:   Policy: Site: 918/ASN024   Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

Summary:

Issue:

PEX Session:

Item Question

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

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.

12/11/2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accessn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3748.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td>O M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 1026/ASS017 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

Summary:

Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 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: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

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.
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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 affordable's, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Document:**
- Site: 883/ASN026
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**
- Map: Site: 883/ASN026
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- Issue:
- PEX Session: 1

**Representation Text:**
1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3-4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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, <em>Rhondda Fawr Northern Cwms and Slopes</em> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan
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Filtered to show: (All representations)
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**Document:**

Site: 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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**

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**

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 affordability, 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 Text

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

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.

Item Question

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
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<th>Late</th>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

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.

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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Site:** 883/ASN026

**Issue:**

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

2. 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 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 to 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.
### Item Question

1. **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 Penypych 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.

2. **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 Penypych mountain and borders Penypych 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.
### Summary:

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 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 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 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.
### Item Question 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 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 affordable, 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

**Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Issue:**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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.

2. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

   It failing the test of soundness CE2 in that:

   1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
3754.A1

Document: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhornda Road

Summary:

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

The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhornda 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 Blaenrhornda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhornda. Several accidents, one with a child who 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 Blaenrhornda 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 Blaenrhornda Road' being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.

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.

---

12/11/2009
**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

1. **Support (Yes)**
   - 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 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**: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

2. **Why 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 affordable 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add’t SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep’t Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3754.A3</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1 - 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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 NSASFormer Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3755.A1

Document:

Map:

Policy:

Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Item Question

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

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.
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.

---

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Document:**

**Site:** 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

**Map:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

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

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 SAAF 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.

**Item Question**

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 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 to 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.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Date Lodged</th>
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<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of SA/SEA</th>
<th>EVIDE No FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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Document: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)  
Policy:  
Map:  

Summary:  

**Issue:** 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**  

**Soundness Tests**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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.

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 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 to 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.
**Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
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</thead>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**  
- **Map:** Policy:  
- **Site:** 871/ASN023  
- **Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. **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**

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

**Representative Text**

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Document:**

- Site: 871/ASN023
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

- Map: [Policy NSA 5 Map]
- Site: 871/ASN023
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

- **Issue:**
- **Map:**

**Summary:**

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**

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 affordable, 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.
Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Representation Text:

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 SSAM 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.

Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Representation Text:

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1, for Rhondda Fawr.
2. It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.
3. It is unsustainability 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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.
2. 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:
1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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

**Policy:** NSA 5

**Site:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
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.

### Soundness Tests

**Item Question: 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 Details**

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

**Representation No:**

**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

- **PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
**Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repn No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3763.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

- 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.

---

**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.
Item Question | Representation Text
---|---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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 SSASF 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.

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 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 to 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.
### Item Question

13 - 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

25. 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 afforables, 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that: It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr. It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study. It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5. It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas. It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather. It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure. A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question 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 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**  
by: Representation No

**Document:**  
Map:   Policy:  
Site: 1026/ASS017   Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**  
Issue:

PEX Session:

**Representation Text**

1  
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 Clym 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**  
Soundness Tests

2  
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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Issue:** 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 affordable houses, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Representation Text**

**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3-4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1 3-4 | 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 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 to 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.
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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3767.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Representation Text**

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

**Document:**
- Map: [Map]
- Policy: [Policy]
- Site: 918/ASN024
- Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**
- Issue:
- PEX Session:

**Item Question**

1. 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 Clynn 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**

2. 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 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep't Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3768.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- **Map:** Site: 1026/ASS017 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road
- **Policy:**

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3768.A4</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
  1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
  2. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. **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 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1. 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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.  
The 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.
--- | ---
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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 Affordable, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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.
   - The 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. 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 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 to 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.
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**Document:**
- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
- **PEX Session:**

1. **Item Question:** 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.

2. **Item Question:** 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 affordable, 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.

---

12/11/2009
### Representation Text

**Representation Text**

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

### Soundness Tests

**Soundness Tests**

```
1 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 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 to 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)3, has yet to be considered.
```
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**Document:**

- **Site:** 871/ASN023
- **Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
- **PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

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.

**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 affordable, 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.
### Item Question

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

   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.

2. **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 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 to 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.
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: 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 affordable. 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.
### Item Question
1  3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

- 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.

### 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 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 to 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.
**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** | **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 affordable homes, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

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.

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.
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Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Representation Text

Policy: Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Representation Text:

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.

Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Representation Text:

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Representation Detail
by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3776.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document:

Map:   Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Summary:

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

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, Blaenrhondod 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.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3777.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

1  3 - 4  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 Text**

3777.A2

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Map:** Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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

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 situated slap in the centre of the largest SSAS 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 NSAS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**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 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 to 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.
**Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3778.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

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**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)</th>
<th>PEX Session:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary:**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   
   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.

2. **Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?**
   
   - It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.
   - It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.
   - It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.
   - It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.
   - It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.
   - It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.
   - A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.

---

**Item Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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

**Representations**

**Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Site:** 883/ASN026

**Summary:**

1. **Item Question:**
   - Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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.

2. **Item Question:**
   - 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 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 to 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 Text**

I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. 2 3 4

It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.

It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.

It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.

It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.

It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.

A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of...</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3780.A1</td>
<td>S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:** Policy:
- **Site:** 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

- **Issue:** 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5  Why incl/excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation No:**

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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.

   The 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.

**Item Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
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<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
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<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</table>

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Issue:

**Summary:**

**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl. of site?

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, Blaenronthda 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.

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 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 to 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.
**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Why incl/excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It would even be safe for housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Furthermore it is sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factory proposal in South Wales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>winter without emergency cover of any kind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The original site boundary line shown in policy NSA5 was totally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unacceptable, but this revised version presented so that the Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can increase his housing allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to cover his cost in undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text**

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.
**Document:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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:**

2  
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.  
The 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:  
  1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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. |
**Item Question**: 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**: 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 Text

Document: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Representation Text

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.

Soundness Tests

Item Question 2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Reply

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3786.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

PEX Session: Item Question

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text**

**Item Question**

2  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 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 to 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.

---

12/11/2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3787.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

(Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5))

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1 - 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**

1. 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 afforables, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Access No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3788.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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.

**Item Question** | **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 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 to 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.
Item Question: 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: 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.
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Representative Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3789.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Issue:**

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.

**Item Question**

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

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 Rhondda Fawr.
     2. It is not based 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 to 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.

**Soundness Tests**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Access No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3790.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Map:  Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road  PEX Session:  

Summary: 

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.

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.

12/11/2009  Page 977 of 2323
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.

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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 SSASF 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.

Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Representation Text:
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: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Representation Text:
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.
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 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.

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.
## Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3791.A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:**
  - Site: 871/ASN023
  - Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

- **PEX Session:**
  - Item Question

**Summary:**

1. **Purpose of Representation:**
   - 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.

2. **Soundness Tests:**
   - 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1.3-4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

| Item Question | Reply |
---|---|
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 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 to 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 Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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.
   - The 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.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordable 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordable Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question** 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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 SSAP 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.

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 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 feasible due to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3794.A1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

1. **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**

2. **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.
## Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**Rep’n No** | **Access No** | **Date Lodged** | **Late?** | **Source Type** | **Mode Status** | **Modified** | **Petition of** | **Add’l** | **SA/SEA** | **Repr Council** | **Officer** | **Recommendation** | **Response**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
3794.A2 | O | M | ☐ | | | | | | | |

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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.

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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation No:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

1. **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.

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 3 - 4       | 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. |
| 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 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 to 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. |
### Summary:

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 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 1

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 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 2

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 Penyphc mountain and borders Penyphc 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>ADD'L</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3795.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Site:** 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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 affordability 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 affordability 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.
| Rep’n No | Accession No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source Type | Mode Status | Modified | Petition of | Evidence in Parts | Add’l SA/SEA Repr Council Officer Recommendation Response |
|----------|--------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 3795.A3  | S M          |             |       |             |             |          |             |                   |                   |                     |                      |                     |

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

**Issue:**

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**

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

**Representation Text**

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 affordabilitys, 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.
**Item Question**  
1 3 - 4  Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  

   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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**  
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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA Rep'ns</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3796.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

**Item Question**

1. **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.

2. **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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation No:** 3796.A2

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site

**Summary:**

Issue:

1.3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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 SSFAF 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.

**Item Question**

1. Soundness Tests

   1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

---

**Date Lodged:** 12/11/2009  
**Page 999 of 2323**
Representation Text

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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 Text**

**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1.3-4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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 SS/AF 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.

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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representative Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3798.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

1. 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.

2. 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 Text

**Item Question**

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

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.

---

**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 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 to 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 Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3799.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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.

**Item Question**

2. 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 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 to 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.
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.

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.
**Rep'n No:** 3800.A2  
**Document:** Map:  
**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)  
**Issue:**  
**PEX Session:**  
**Summary:**  
**Representation Text:**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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.
   - The 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.

2. **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 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 to 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**

**Rep'n No** | **Accsnn No** | **Date Lodged** | **Late?** | **Source Type** | **Mode Status** | **Modified** | **Petition of** | **Add'l SA/SEA** | **No FRTHR EVID.** | **TREAT** | **EVIDENCE** | **NO EVID.** | **REPR COUNCIL** | **OFFICER** | **Recommendation** | **Response**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
3801.A1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

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**

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.
## Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Issue:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

1. **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.**
2. **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.**
3. **This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.**
4. **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.**
5. **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.

---

### Soundness Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Acssn No</td>
<td>Date Lodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3802.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document: Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

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**

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
   - 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.
   - The 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.

2. 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 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 to 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

**Document:** Map: Policy:

**Site:** 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

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**

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep'r Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3803.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site

**Summary:**

**Item Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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

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.

**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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3805.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:

Item Question

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.

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 affordable housing, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? 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 SSAP 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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 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 to 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**  
by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Acosn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3806.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**  
Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**  
Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**  
Issue:

1. **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.

2. **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.

---

12/11/2009 Page 1018 of 2323
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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.

---

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 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 to 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.
## Item Question
1. 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.

## Soundness Tests
2. 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 Text**

**Item Question**

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

**Soundness Tests**

2. 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3808.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Policy: Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue: PEX Session:

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.

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.
**Issue:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 Text**

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

**Representations Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accsno</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3809.A1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- **Site:** 871/ASN023
- **Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Policy:**

- **Map:**
- **Issue:**

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

1. **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.

2. **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 affordable, 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Representative Detail

by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3809.A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Policy:

Map:

Issue:

PEX Session:

Summary:

Item Question  Representation Text

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

   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.

---

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 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 to 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.
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.

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

**Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Representation Text**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3811.A1

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Policy: Map: Issue:

Summary:

Item Question Representation Text

1 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.

2 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 Text**

**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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.  
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 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 to 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 Text

**Issue:** 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**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

2. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

---

**Soundness Tests**

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 affordable, 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.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Soundness Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**
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</tr>
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**Document:**

*Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)*

**Policy:**

**Map:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

**Soundness Tests**

1. 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.

2. 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.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category <code>Tourism and Leisure</code> AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Alternate 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.

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 afforables, 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 Text

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.

### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1, for 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

### Item Question: 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 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 to 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.
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.

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 affordability, 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.
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 BEGGRS BELIEF.

THE 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.

---

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

   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.

---

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 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 to 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 No:** 3817.A1

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Item Question:** 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.

**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.
### Item Question
1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

### Soundness Tests
2. **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 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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 affordable, 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.
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**Document:**

- **Map:**
  - Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
  - PEX Session: Item Question: Representation Text

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

- 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.

**Item Question**

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 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 to 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.
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Document: Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

**Issue:**

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**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
2. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
2. 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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>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 NSAs5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that: 1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that: 1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.</td>
</tr>
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**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023

**Site:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**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.

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 affordable, 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 | 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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 SSER 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.
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 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 to 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.
3821.A1

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

**Item Question**
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**
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.
**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

---

**Item Question**: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accessn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>No FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3822.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>

Document: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Item Question

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

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 affordabilitys, 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 Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  

  - 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 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 to 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.

---

12/11/2009 Page 1051 of 2323
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.

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.
**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 SSASF 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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. **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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Repr'n No** | **Accssn No** | **Date Lodged** | **Late?** | **Source Type** | **Mode Status** | **Modified** | **Petition of** | **Add'l in parts** | **SA/SEA Repr Council** | **Officer** | **Recommendation** | **Response**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
3824.A2 | O | M | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Document:**
Map: Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**
Issue:

**PEX Session:**

**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**

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.
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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 SSADF 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 affordable, 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.
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 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.

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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 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.

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.
**Rep’n No:** 3826.A2  
**Access No:** O M  
**Date Lodged:**  
**Late?**  
**Source Type:**  
**Mode Status:**  
**Modified:**  
**TREAT Evidence:**  
**NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA Rep Council:**  
** Recommendation:**  

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017  
**Site:** Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road  
**PEX Session:**  

**Summary:**  
**Issue:**  
**Policy:**  
**Map:**  
**Issue:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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  

1. 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.

2. 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3826.A4</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Document:**

- **Map:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
- **Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
- **PEX Session:**
- **Issue:**
- **Summary:**

#### Item Question

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

- 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.

---

**Item Question**

**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 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 to 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.

---
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### Item Question 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 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 Text**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representation Text

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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3829.A1</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map: Policy: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

Issue:

PEX Session:

- **Item Question:** 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 affordability 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** Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

| 2 | 5 | Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
|---|---|---
| 1 | 3 | This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.
| 2 | 4 | 1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.
| 3 | 5 | 2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing
| 4 |   | 3) There is no proven need in this area for affordability Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.
| 5 |   | 4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.
| 6 |   | 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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 Penypych 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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 Penypych mountain and borders Penypych 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accsn No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3829.A3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue:

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 | Representation Text
---|---

Item Question | 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.
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**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Representation Text**

**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   
   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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. 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 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 to 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 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 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 afffordables, 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.
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.

---

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Item Question 1

**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 2

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

**Repr'n No** | **Access No** | **Date Lodged** | **Late?** | **Source Type** | **Mode Status** | **Modified** | **TREAT** | **EVIDENCE** | **NO FRTHR EVID.** | **SA/SEA** | **Repr Council** | **Officer** | **Recommendation** | **Response**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
3831.A2 | O | M | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Map:**

**Site:** 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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

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.

---

**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 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 to 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.
3832.A1

**Document:** Site: 918/ASN024  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

1 3 - 4

2 5

**Representation Text**

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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
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.

---

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 affordable, 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.
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.

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.
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 Penypych mountain and borders Penypych 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.
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 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.

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.
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.

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 afforables, 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.
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.

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### 3834.A1

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site

**Issue:**

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.

---

### Soundness Tests

**Item Question**

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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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 No**: 3835.A1  
**Document**: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary**:  
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 1**: 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 2**: 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 Text

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

## Soundness Tests

1. **It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.**
2. **It is not based 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 to 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.**
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**Document:**

**Policy:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map:</th>
<th>Site: 918/ASN024</th>
<th>Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road</th>
<th>PEX Session:</th>
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</table>

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1) 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.

**Soundness Tests**

2) 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.
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 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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Text**

**Issue**

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

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.

**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 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 to 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)33, has yet to be considered.
## Item Question

1. **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

2. **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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 SSADF 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 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 to 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.
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.

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 afforables, 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.
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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

   - **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.**

### Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**
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**Document:**

**Map:** Policy: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

PEX Session: Policy: Map: Issue:

**Representation Text**

1. **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.

2. **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.
**Issue:** 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 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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordable Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Detail**

**Policy:** Agreement No 5 (NSA 5) - Former Fernhill Colliery Site

**Item Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text:**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question:** Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text:**

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 affordable, 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 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 to 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.
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Document: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)
Policy: Map:  

Summary:

**Issue:**

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**

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 affordable, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)E3, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accssn No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3841.A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
Map: Site: 871/ASN023, Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
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.

**Item Question:**
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

This 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.

The 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This 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.

The 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

12/11/2009
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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

  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.

### Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

- **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 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 to 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.

---

**Document:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)  

**Policy:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)  

**PEX Session:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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 Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 affordsables 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Soundness Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Text

**Item Question**: 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.

---

## Soundness Tests

**Item Question**: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3842.A4</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- Site: 883/ASN026
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

- Map:       
- Issue:     

**Summary:**

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.

**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
2. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text**

- 1 3 - 4  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.
- 2 5  It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:
  1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3843.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map:   Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

Map:   Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1 - 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**

Soundness Tests

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

The 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.

Soundness Tests

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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 affordability, 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. |
13 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

25 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 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 to 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.
**Representations**

**Policy:** NSA 5

**Item Question:** 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:** 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 afforables, 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 Text

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

### Soundness Tests

**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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3846.A1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. **Soundness Tests**

   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.

   2. **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 affordable, 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 Text**

**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Soundness Tests**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.
   - It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.
   - It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.
   - It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.
   - It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.
   - It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.
   - A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3847.A1</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Soundness Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 affordability, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
**Item Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Access No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3848.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map:  
Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)  

**Policy:**

Issue:  

**PEX Session:**

Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  

Representation Text:

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.

Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  

Soundness Tests:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
13 - 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.

I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

25 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.
1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

2. 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 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 to 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.
1. 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.

2. 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.
**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

**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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**Representation No:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

1. **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.

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Acssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3851.A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**Representation Text**

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

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
**Item Question**  
1 - 4  Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

- 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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 Text

**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.

---

**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.
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.

---

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.
### Item Question
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
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 affordability, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)E3, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

**Document:**
- Map: [insert map reference]
- Policy: [insert policy reference]

**Site:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
  - Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
- **Representative Text:**
  - 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:**
- Map: [insert map reference]
- Issue: [insert issue]

**PEX Session:**
- [insert PEX session information]

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
  - Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
- **Representative Text:**
  - 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 affordable, 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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.
2 | 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 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 to 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.
### Item Question

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

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence in parts</th>
<th>NO FR/THR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3856.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- Site: 883/ASN026  
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**
- Map: Site
- Issue: Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
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.

**Item Question**

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

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 Rhondda Fawr.
     2. It is not based 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 to 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.
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.

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 affordable, 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.
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.

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

Firstly it is contrary to the Local Plan objectives to accommodate new settlements, particularly in an area of high density and congestion. There is already an over abundance of low density settlement in the area which would not accommodate this type of settlement.

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.

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 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 to 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.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Access No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3858.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Policy: Map: Issue:

Summary:

**Issue:**
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

3 - 4
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.

**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 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 to 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.
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.

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 affordability, 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 Text**

**Representation Text**

**Item Question** | **Reply**
---|---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
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.

**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 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 to 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.
Item Question: 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: 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.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The submission of the alternate extended settlement boundary around the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Site of Former Fernhill Colliery to accommodate additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development is totally outrageous. This would in fact create a new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>settlement of 800 plus houses, more than double the size and density of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the present Village with its unique Conservation Area and totally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overwhelming it. The site in the Urban Capacity Study was only deemed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viable for Tourism and Leisure, so why was it allowed to be put forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a Strategic Site for Mixed Use Development? It beggars belief. This</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes. The site proposes no Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocation, has Flooding issues, Access issues and requires major land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reclamation before it would even be safe for housing. Furthermore it is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sited slap in the centre of the largest SSAF Wind Factory proposal in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Wales. Located at the Northern head of the Rhondda Fawr it cannot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support sustainable means of transport and the proposed access road off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the notorious A4061 would mean the site will be totally cut off in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>winter without emergency cover of any kind. The original site boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>line shown in policy NSA5 was totally unacceptable, but this revised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>version presented so that the Developer can increase his housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocation from 400 to 800 plus, in order to cover his cost in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undertaking the necessary land reclamation and new road access, has not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community facilities and goes beyond credibility. I strongly object to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not based on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question 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 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

**Document:** Map: Policy:

**Site:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

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

   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 NSAS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Lat?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3862.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
Site: 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Map:**

**Policy:**

**Site:**

**871/ASN023**  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question:**
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:**
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

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Issue:**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - **Representation Text:**
   > 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.
   > The 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.

2. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
   - **Representation Text:**
   > It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:
   > 1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3863.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

- **PEX Session:**

**Representation Text:**

1. **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.

2. **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.
**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

The proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhonddda 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.

---

**Item Question**: 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 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 to 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.

---

12/11/2009
**Item Question**: 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**: 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 Text

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

---

### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Representation Detail**

**Revised Boundary Change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.**

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

**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 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 to 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

**Document:**

- **Map:** Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
  - PEX Session:
  - Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
  - Reply: 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.
  - 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.

- **Soundness Tests:**
  - Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
  - Soundness Tests: 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.
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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. **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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Representation Text

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
**Item Question**

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**

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 affordable, 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.
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3868.A2

Document:  Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
Policy:  Map:  Issue:

Summary:

Issue:

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

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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

Item Question  Representation Text

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 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 to 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.
**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**  | **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 afforables, 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.
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**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.
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**Document:**

Map: Policy:

Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Item Question** | **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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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**Document:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

**Representation Text**

1. **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.

2. **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 affordable, 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### REPRESENTATION DETAIL
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<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
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<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Map:</th>
<th>Site: 883/ASN026</th>
<th>Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)</th>
<th>PEX Session:</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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#### Document:

- **Map:** Policy: Site: 883/ASN026

#### Issue:

- **PEX Session:**

#### Summary:

- **Representative Text:**

  1. **Item Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

     - **Representation Text:**

       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.

#### Item Question

- **Soundness Tests**

  1. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

     - **Reply:**

       It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

       1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
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Representation No: 3872.A2

Policy: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 No: 3873.A1

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map:

**Issue:**

**Summary:**

**Representation Text**

1. **Item Question**: 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.

   Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. **Item Question**: 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 affordable’s, 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3874.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)  PEX Session:  
Policy:  
Map:  

Summary:  

Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  

Representation Text:  

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: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?  

Reply:  

Soundness Tests:  

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3874.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

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 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 to 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.

---

12/11/2009  Page 1171 of 2323
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.

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 oversubscribed and there is no proven need for affordables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Access No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3876.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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

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.

- The 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 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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Acce$$n No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3877.A1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:** PEX Session:

**Representative Text**

1. **Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - **Text:**
     
     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 Morgannw 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.

2. **Question:** Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
   - **Text:**
     
     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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Text**

**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
**Item Question**: 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.

I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Item Question**: 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 Text**

**Item Question**

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

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 SSASF 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.

**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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. 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.

   Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. 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 afforables, 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.
Representative: Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

**Represented by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>附件</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3879.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

2. 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 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 to 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.

---
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### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

**Document:**
- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023, Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
- **PEX Session:**

#### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Acssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add’l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3880.A1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Represented by:**

1. 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.

2. 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.
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.

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA Repres</th>
<th>Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3881.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

1. 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.

2. 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.
**RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3881.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site

**Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not based on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3882.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

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.

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 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 present.
### Representation Text

**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text**

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.

---

### Soundness Tests

**Item Question**: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Reply**

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 Text

#### Item Question

1. **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.

   Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundness Tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/11/2009 Page 1189 of 2323
Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue:

PEX Session:

Item Question

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

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 Text**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reply:

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Acssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3885.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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.

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.

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

1. 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.

2. 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.
### RHONDDA CYNON TAFCOUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**Repr'n No**: 3885.A2  |  **Mode Status**: O  |  **Modified**: M  |  **Policy**: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
- **Representation Text**:
  > 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.
  > The 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.

**Item Question**: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
- **Reply**:
  > It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:
    1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 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.

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 affordable, 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 Text**

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Additional</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3887.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map:  
Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**  
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**  
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**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.

**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.

12/11/2009
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Acccssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>SA/SEA Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3888.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Site: 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

Map:  
Site: 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

Issue:

**Summary:**

- **Item Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

  - **Representation Text:**
    
    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:** Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

  - **Representation Text:**
    
    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 Text**

Submit 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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
## Document:

**Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Site:** 871/ASN023

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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.

## Soundness Tests

2

**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 affordability, 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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.  
The 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 SSASF 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

| Item Question | Reply |
--- | ---
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 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 to 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.  
--- | ---

12/11/2009
### Item Question

1. **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

2. **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 Text**

**Item Question**

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

   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 SSADF 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.

**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 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 3-4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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. |
| 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 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 to 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. |
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.

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1, 3 - 4  | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   | 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.

| 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 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 to 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.
Representations

Representation No: 3893.A1

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.

Soundsness Tests

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 Text**

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

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 NSAS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Soundness Tests**

2 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 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 to 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 No:** 3894.A1

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:** 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.

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Text**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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.

12/11/2009
**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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.

2. 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep't Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3896.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

**Issue:**

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**

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

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.

Item Question: 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REPRESENTATION DETAIL by: Representation No
Filtered to show: (All representations)

Document:
Map:
Policy:
Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue:
PEX Session:

Item Question Representation Text

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

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.

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 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 to 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.
**Representations**

**Issue:**
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.

---

**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.
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
1 - 4

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.

### 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3899.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

**Issue:** 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**

1 3 - 4  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.
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**Representations**

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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.

---

### Soundness Tests

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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.

2. **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 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 to 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.
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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 affordable, 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

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
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.

**Issue:**
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.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 favourables, in fact there is already a surplus of empty houses in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representation Text

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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

Soundness Tests

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 afforables, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3902.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Issue:** PEX Session:

**Summary:**

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

   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.

**Item Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   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.

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

   1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3903.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Policy: Map:

Summary:

Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Representative Text:

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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

Item Question: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Reply:

Soundness Tests:

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 affordable houses, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep'r Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3903.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)  
Policy: Map: Issue:  

Summary:  

Item Question  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 3 - 4 | 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.  
The proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondod 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. |
| 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 Rhondda Fawr.  
2. It is not soundly 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 to 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

**Policy:** NSA 5

**Site:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site

**Issue:**

1. **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.

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question

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

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

**Item Question** | **Reply**
--- | ---
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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3907.A1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

Summary:

**Issue:**

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**

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.

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.
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 rear 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.

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.
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**Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023

**Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

**Representation Text**

1. **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.

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
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<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3907.A4</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**
Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
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.

**Item Question**
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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

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.

**Item Question**
Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

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 Rhondda Fawr.
2 It is not based 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 to 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.
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.

This 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.

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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**Document:**
- **Map:** Policy: Site: 883/ASN026  
  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
  - Item Question: Representation Text
  - 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
    - 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

- **Item Question:** 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Accsn No</th>
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<th>Modified</th>
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</table>
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Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

PEX Session:

**Representation Text**

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

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 SSASF 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.

**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 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 to 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 Text

3911.A1

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Policy: Map:

Summary:

Issue:

PEX Session: PEX Session:

Soundness Tests

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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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, Blaenrhonddda 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Môrannwag 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.

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 affordable housing, 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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.

2. 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 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 to 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.
**Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3913.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
Map: 
Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Item Question:** 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:** 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Treat Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3913.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Site:** 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:** Item Question 1 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Item Question**

1. 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3914.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

Soundness Tests

1  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.

2  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.
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3914.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   
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.

2. **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 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 to 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.
Item Question: 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 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: 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Policy:</th>
<th>Site: 1026/ASS017</th>
<th>Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road</th>
<th>PEX Session:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Document:**

Map:  Policy:  Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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 afforables 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**

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

- 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 afforables 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.
### Item Question
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
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 affordability, 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 No:** 3915.A4

**Document:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA5)

**Policy:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA5)

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question:**

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

   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.
   
The 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.

**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 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 to 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 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.

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.
Item Question | Representation Text
--- | ---
3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

Item Question | 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 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 NS5.
4. It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.
5. It is not achievable due to 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 Text

**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Text**

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

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

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3918.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:** 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**

**Representation Text**

1. **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.

2. **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.
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Republic of Ireland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accesss No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3918.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:** Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
- **Summary:**

  **Issue:**

  - **PEX Session:**

  - **Item Question:**

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

      - 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 SSAT 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.

  **Soundness Tests**

  1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.

  2. It is not based 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 to 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3919.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 3 - 4       | 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. |
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

- **Document:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
- **PEX Session:** 
- **Issue:**

#### Item Question

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. 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 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 to 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.
### Item Question

1. 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

2. 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 affordable, 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 Text**

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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 Text**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep'r Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3922.A1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Map:**  Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Item Question**: 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**: 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.

---
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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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 Text**

**Item Question**

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.

   **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.
13 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

25 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 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 to 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.
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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map:

**Issue:**

**TREAT**

**EVIDENCE**

**NO FRTHR EVID.**

**SA/SEA**

**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.

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 affordable, 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.
Filter to show: (All representations)

Document: Map: Policy:

Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue:

PEX Session:

Item Question Representation Text

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

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.

Item Question 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 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 to 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.
### Item Question 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 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.
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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

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

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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 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 to 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)33, has yet to be considered.
### Item Question 1: 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 2: 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 affordable housing, 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
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<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
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</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:**
  - Site: 883/ASN026
  - Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

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

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:
  1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

---

12/11/2009 Page 1281 of 2323
Item Question | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
--- | ---
1 | 3 - 4
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 | Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
--- | ---
2 | 5
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.
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.

---

1. 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 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 to 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.
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Document: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)  
Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)  
PEX Session:  
Summary:  

**Item Question**: 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.

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question**: 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 Text**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.
Representation Text

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

Item Question 2

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 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 to 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan
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</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

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.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
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</table>

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3 - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soundness Tests**  
1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Representative Details

**Policy:** NSA 5 (Former Fernhill Colliery Site)

**Map:** Site 871/ASN023

**Summary:**

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:** 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 affordability, 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.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3935.A1</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3935.A2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Representation Text

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

### Soundness Tests

1. **It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.**
1  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.

2  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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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

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 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 to 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.
Item Question: 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: 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 affordable, 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3937.A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map:  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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

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.

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1  It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.
2  It is not based 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 to 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.
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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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 Text

**Issue:** 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 afforables 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.

---

### Soundness Tests

**Item Question:** 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FR/THR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3939.A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Issue:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhomdda 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 Clym 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 Penyypc 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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 Penyypc mountain and borders Penyypc 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question:
**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:
**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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in Parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3940.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map:  
Policy: Site: 871/ASN023  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question**

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**

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.
**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.

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 affordable, 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 Text

**Issue:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

### Soundness Tests

**Item Question**: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

- It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.
- It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.
- It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.
- It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.
- It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.
- It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.
- A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.
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.

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 affordable, 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 Text**

**Issue:**

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

   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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. 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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representative Detail** by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
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**Document:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

**Map:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**  

**Representation Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12/11/2009  Page 1309 of 2323
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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 afforables, 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.
## Item Question

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?**

2. 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 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 to 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.
**Item Question**: 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.

I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Item Question**: 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 affordable, 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 Text

**Representation No:** 3945.A2  
**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)  

**Summary:**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 affordable, 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.
**Item Question**

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

   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.

---

**Item Question**

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 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 to 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 Details

**Document:**
- **Site:** 871/ASN023  
  **Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
  - **PEX Session:**

**Representation Text:**

1. **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.

2. **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 affordable, 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 Text**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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.
**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Item Question**: 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This alternative proposal, which has not 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 afforables, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Text**

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Reply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Document:**

Site: 871/ASN023
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

Map: Site: 871/ASN023
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

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 Text

**Representation Text**

**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question**: 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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3951.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:** Site: 871/ASN023
- **Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. **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.

2. **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 affordable, 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

**Document:** Map: Policy:

**Site:** 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:** Issue:

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3952.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text**

1. **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.

---

2. **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 Text**

**Item Question**
- **3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

- 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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
Item Question: 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: 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 Text**

**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   - 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 SSADF 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.

**Soundness Tests**

2. 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 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 to 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.
### Summary:
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 1
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text**
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 2
Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text**
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.
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

### Item Question: 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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Text**

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

Issue:

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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.
   - The 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.

2. 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 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 to 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 Text

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.

---

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 affordable, 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1-4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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.  
The proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA25-7 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 SSADF 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.

---

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 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 to 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.
Rep'n: 3957.A1
Acceesn No: S
Date Lodged: M
Late?: No
Source Type: TREAT
Mode Status: EVID.
Modified: NO FRTHR EVID.
SA/SEA: PET
Repr Council: SA/SEA
Officer: Recommendation
Response:

Document: Map: Policy: Site: Map: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)
Summary: Issue: PEX Session:

Item Question: 1 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

Representation Text:
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: 2 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Representation Text:
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

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3957.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
  - Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
  - **Representation Text:**
    - 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

### 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 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 to 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3958.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

PEX Session: Item Question

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 affordable, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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

### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**by:** Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep'n Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3959.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map:  

Policy:  

Site: 883/ASN026  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**  
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 SSASF 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.

**Item Question**  
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 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 to 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’ A5(N)33, has yet to be considered.

---

12/11/2009  
Page 1341 of 2323
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>Evidence in parts</th>
<th>NO Further EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep’r Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3960.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Item Question**

1 3 - 4 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

12/11/2009
**Representation No:** 3961.A1

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question:** 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question

1. 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. Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

### Item Question

2. 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 Text**

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. **It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.**
2. **It is not based 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add’l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3963.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- **Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal will provide much needed employment and put the Rhondda Fawr firmly on the Tourist trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy:</td>
<td>Map:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Item Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 - 4</strong></td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 NSAs Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 - 5</strong></td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issue: 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 corrections 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.

### Soundness Tests

**Item Question:** 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 affordable, 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.
**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

---

**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 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 to 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.
<table>
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<tr>
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**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5) 

**Site:** 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5) 

**PEX Session:** 

**Summary:** 

**Issue:** 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** 

| 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** 

| 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.
Item Question  
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

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 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 to 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.
**Item Question**

1. 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**

2. 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.
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**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**
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**Filtered to show:** (All representations)
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**Document:**

- **Map:** Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. **Item Question**

   **Representation Text**

   - Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Soundness Tests**

1. **Item Question**

   **Representation Text**

   - 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 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 to 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 Text**

**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
### Item Question

**1.** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

### Soundness Tests

**2.** 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 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 to 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.
**Item Question**

1. 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.

---

2. 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.
## Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

### Representation Detail

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

### Summary:

**Issue:**

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.

### Item Question

1. **Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   
   - **Representation Text:**
     
     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.

2. **Question:** Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
   
   - **Representation Text:**
     
     It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:
     
     1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Item Question**

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**

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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID. SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3969.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

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

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

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 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 NSAS.
4. It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.
5. It is not achievable due to 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.

---
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### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3970.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

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**

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.
### Item Question

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

   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.

   The 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 SSF 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.

2. **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 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 to 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.
Item Question: 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: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**Policy:** NSA-9  **Site:** 1026/ASS017 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

#### Summary

- **Issue:** Petition of in parts
- **Add'l:** SA/SEA
- **Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MAP:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**SUMMARY:**

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 2**

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 Text**

**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3973.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
- **Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
- **PEX Session:**

**Summary:**

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.

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why lncl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:
  1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

---

12/11/2009
**Item Question**

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.

Therefore strongly agree that AS(N) 23 is the most viable option for NSA 5 the Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**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.
**Document:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026  
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

Issue:

PEX Session:

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

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.

---

**Item Question**  
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 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 to 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Representations

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Summary:

1. 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.

2. 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 affordable, 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Representation Detail

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

Summary:

Issue:

Item Question

Representation Text

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

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.

Item Question

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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

**by:** Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:**

**Site:** 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 afforables, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Text**

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

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.

**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 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 to 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.
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.

---

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 afforables, 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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.

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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### Representation Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
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<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Site:** 871/ASN023
- **Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)**

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
- **PEX Session:**

**Representation Text**

1. **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.

2. **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 affordable, 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.
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.

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - The submission
   - 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?
   - 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.

2. 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 Rhondda Fawr.
     2. It is not based 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 to 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

**Policy:** Site: 918/ASN024  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Issue:**

- **1** 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.**

**Soundness Tests**

- **2** 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 Penyph 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.

---

12/11/2009  Page 1381 of 2323
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 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.

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 affordability 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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 affordable, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

**Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3980.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Policy:

Summary:

**Issue:**

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**

**Representation Text**

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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 SSASF 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that: 1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question**  
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**  
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 Text**

**Item Question**

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

**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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3982.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TREAT</td>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>NO FRTHR EVID.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Policy: Map: Issue:

Summary:

Subject: 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: Soundness Tests

1 3 - 4 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence in parts</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep't Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3982.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- Map: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**
- Map: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
### Document:

#### Site: 871/ASN023

*Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)*

#### Summary:

**Issue:** 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

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.

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 Text**

**Issue:**
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text**

*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.*

*The 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.*

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.
2. It is not based 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 to 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.
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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation Text**

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.
### Rep'n No: 3985.A1

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

1. **Issue:** 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.

2. **Question:** 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**

**Document:** Map: Policy:

**Site:** 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:** 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.
- The 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.

**Item Question**

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

**Reply**

I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Soundness Tests**

1. 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 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 to 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.
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 | Representation Text
---|---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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 SSASF 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.
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 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 to 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 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.

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.
## Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**Document:**
- **Map:**
- **Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:** 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.
- **PEX Session:**
- **Item Question**
  - 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

#### Representation Text

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.
4. 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.
5. 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3988.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Map:** PEX Session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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 affordable, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

- - - - -
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 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 to 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.
### Item Question

1. 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

2. 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.
**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

**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 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 to 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 Text

#### Item Question

1. **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

2. **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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Representative Detail

Filter to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
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<th>Add'l</th>
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</table>

Document:
Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

Summary:

Issue:

PEX Session:

Item Question

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 affordable 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.

Soundness Tests

1 3 - 4 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 affordable 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.
### Item Question

1. **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.

2. **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.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not based on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representations**

**Document:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:** Item Question

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   - 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

2. 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 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 to 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.
**Issue:** 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**: 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 afforables, 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 Text

I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3993.A1</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

PEX Session:

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

Object: 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 Penypych 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**  
2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

Object: 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 Penypych mountain and borders Penypych 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.

12/11/2009
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

#### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3993.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

Map:  
Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017  
Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

PEX Session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 Penypch 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 Penypch mountain and borders Penypch 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. |
**Issue:**
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Reply:**
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:**
Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Reply:**
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 Text**

3993.A4

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

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

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

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

2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

---

**Soundness Tests**

1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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 afforables 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep't Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3994.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:** Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

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

**Representation Text**

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 | 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.

---

2 | 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Item Question**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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 Text

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.
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.

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.
3995.A2

Document: Map: Policy:

Site: 1026/ASS017 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

Summary:

Issue:

PEX Session:

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.

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.

12/11/2009
### Item Question: 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: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)/23, has yet to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  3 - 4  Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  5  Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accssn No</td>
<td>Date Lodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3996.A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

**Item Question:** 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:**

**Soundness Tests**

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.
**Item Question**

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**

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 affordability, 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
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 affordable 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.

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 cheap by 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 Penypch mountain and borders Penypch 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordable is not supported by a proven need in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) There is no proven need in this area for Affordable Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accssn No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3997.A3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

Policy: Map: Issue: PEX Session:

Summary: Issue: Soundness Tests

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 Landscape 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.

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 affairs, 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 Text**

**Item Question**  
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

---

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.

The 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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

**Item Question**  
Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

---

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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.
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

1. **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: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

2. **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.
### Item Question

1. **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.

2. **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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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 Penypych mountain and borders Penypych 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. |
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**Document:**

Map: Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. 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.

2. 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

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 afforables, 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.
1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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.
   - The 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.

2. **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 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 to 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 Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 3 - 4</strong> Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 5</strong> Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 affordabilitys, 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? 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.

**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 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 to 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.
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.

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 & Evidence: Representation No.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4001.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:**
  - Site: 1026/ASS017
  - Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

- 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**

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.

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.

---

12/11/2009  Page 1444 of 2323
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.

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 No 4001.A4

### Policy:
Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

### Site:
883/ASN026

### Map:

### Issue:

**Representative Text**

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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

### Soundness Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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.

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.
**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.

**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 Text

1. **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.

2. **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.
**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Item Question** | Soundness Tests
---|---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

- 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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

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 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 to 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.
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.

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.
### 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 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.

### 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.
### Item Question
1. 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.

### Soundness Tests
2. 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.
**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

---

**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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan
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#### Document:

**Map:** Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

#### Summary:

**Issue:**

- 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.

#### Soundness Tests

1. **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 afforables 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.

2. **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 afforables 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.

---
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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 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.

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.
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**Document:**

- **Map:**
  - Policy: Site: 871/ASN023
  - Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

- Map: Site: 871/ASN023
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

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**

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 affordable, 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 Text**

**Representation No:** 4004.A4

**Document:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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 lead to 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.

   The 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.

**Soundness Tests**

2. 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 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 to 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.
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Representation Detail

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

Representation Text

Item Question

Soundness Tests

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

Support (Yes)

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

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.
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### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**Document:**
- Map: Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**
- **Issue:**
- **PEX Session:**

**Item Question:** 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:** 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.
**Document:**

Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

PEX Session:

**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.

---

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
| | 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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category 'Tourism and Leisure' AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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.

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.
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.

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.
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**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

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**

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**

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 affordable, 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.
**Item Question**  
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text**

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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**  
Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text**

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Map: Policy: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road</th>
<th>Issue:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item Question</strong></td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item Question</strong></td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>The suggested change to the settlement boundary to encompass this area under NSA12 takes the lower slopes of Penpych mountain and borders Penpych Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4007.A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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.

**_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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   - 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.
   - The 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.

**Item Question**

2. 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 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 to 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.
### Item Question

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

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not supported by credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It would be detrimental to the only employment opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question

**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

**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 afforables, 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 Text**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

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 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 to 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.
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  
--- | ---
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**

**Document:**
- Site: 883/ASN026
- Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

**Map:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Representative Text:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 afforables, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery 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.

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 No**: 4012.A2

**Policy**: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary**: 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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
**Issue:** 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.

**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 Text**

**Representation No:** 4013.A2  
**Document:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:** 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.

---

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

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.

---

**Item Question**  
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 Rhondda Fawr.

---

**Soundness Tests**

---

12/11/2009
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 | 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.

2 | 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 affordable, 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

The 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.

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 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 to 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.
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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site? 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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 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 to 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accession No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4016.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Policy:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. 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**

**Representation Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 affordable, 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

### REPRESENTATION DETAIL

**by:** Representation No

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4016.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Map:**

**Site:** 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**PEX Session:**

**Issue:**

**Item Question**

**Representation Text**

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

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 SSADF 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

**Reply**

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 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 to 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.

Soundness Tests
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accession No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4017.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:** Policy:

**Site:** 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

**Representation Text**

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>ADJ SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4017.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

Policy: Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

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

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.

**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 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 to 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 Text

**Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

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.

### Soundness Tests

2 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 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 to 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.
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.

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.
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Soundness Tests

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL** by: Representation No

Filtered to show: (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add’l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Policy:** Map: Site: 871/ASN023 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (Policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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**

**Representation Text**

**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.
**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

2 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 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 to 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.
**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)S3, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**REPRESENTATION DETAIL**

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
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<th>SA/SEA Rep'rs Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Site:** 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Policy:**

**Map:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

**Item Question**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   
   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 NSAS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**Item Question**

2. 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 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 to 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 Text**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to the sever 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.
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE in parts</th>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- **Map:** Site: 883/ASN026
- **Policy:** Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**
- **Issue:** 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.
- **PEX Session:**

**Representation Text:**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**

   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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. **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 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 to 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.

---
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
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<th>Petition of</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

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

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1, For 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 to 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 Text**

**Item Question** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

- 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.

**Item Question** 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 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 to 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.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation No**: 4027.A1

**Policy**: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Representation Text**

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

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 NSAS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

**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 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 to 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.
**Item Question** |
--- |
1-4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  

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.  
The 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 SSASF 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.

---  
**Item Question** |
--- |
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 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 to 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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
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.

---

**Item Question** | **Reply**
--- | ---
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 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 to 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.

---
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**Representation Text**

**Issue:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1, For Rhondda Fawr.

2. It is not based 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 to 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 Text

**Representation Text**

1. **Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?**
   - 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.

## Soundness Tests

### Item Question 1
- **Why Incl/Excl 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 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 to 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.
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.

---

**Item Question** | **Reply** | **Soundness Tests**
---|---|---
2 | Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness? | 1  It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.

**Item Question** | **Representation Text**
---|---
1. 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   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.

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 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 to 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.
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Representation Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4034.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- Map: Site: 883/ASN026  Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
  1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
  2. Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

---

**Representation Text**

1.3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   
   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.

---

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 Rhondda Fawr.
   2. It is not based 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 to 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4036.A1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**
- **Map:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)
- **Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

- **PEX Session:**
- **Item Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NSAS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)</th>
<th>PEX Session:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
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.

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

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.

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

**Representation No:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4039.A1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:** Site: 883/ASN026 Former Fernhill Colliery Site (policy NSA 5)

**Issue:**

1. Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

   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.

**Soundness Tests**

2. 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 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 to 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)/Z3, has yet to be considered.
**Issue:**

Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 NS5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

---

**Soundness Tests**

1. It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For 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 to 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.
Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
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.

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 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 to 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3-4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 reclamtion and new road access, has not been accompanied by extra provision for Services, Amenities and Community facilities and goes beyond credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This proposed new boundary line incorporates the Special Landscape Area NSA 25-7 and the SINC, Blaenrhondda Slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to this revised boundary change for the Strategic Site covered by Policy NSA5 Former Fernhill Colliery Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It fails the test of soundness CE2 in that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 It exceeds the housing allocation, contrary to the figures quoted in policy AW1. For Rhondda Fawr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 It is not founded on credible evidence as it failed the Urban Capacity Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 It is unsustainable as proved by the Sustainability Appraisal of NSA5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 It would result in the loss of Special Landscape and SINC Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 It is not achievable due to the several restraints such as access and weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 It would be detrimental to the only Employment Opportunities otherwise available for the area consisting of Tourism and Leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 A relevant alternative site, in the category ‘Tourism and Leisure’ AS(N)23, has yet to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question

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

- 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 NSAS Former Fernhill Colliery Site.

### 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 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 to 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

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

Summary:

13 - 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.

Soundness Tests

25 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.
Item Question | Representation Text
--- | ---
1-3 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 affordable 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.

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 affordable 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.
I am opposed to the proposed alternative site register for land situated at Cwm Farm because of its close proximity to the Dare Valley Country Park. I understand that if the alternative use is granted that there could be development of up to 250 houses on the site. The Country Park was created back in 1974 on the site of derelict colliery sites and since then with development and careful management we now have a park that attracts over 90,000 visitors per year, 80% of these visitors are locals who use the park as a facility for informal recreation such as walking, jogging, exercising the dog, horse riding and many other activities. The park is also extensively used by local children for many countryside activities and adventures. Visitors from further afield take the benefit of using either our touring caravan site or our residential centre and the park is increasing its reputation as an ideal base for holidaymakers to explore South Wales. Indeed it is worth noting that the Dare Valley Touring Caravan site is the only one of its type in Rhondda-Cynon-Taff. The development of such a site I think would create an unacceptable pressure on the access to Dare Valley and on the approach roads leading into the park off Monk Street. The alternative use of this site would also destroy what is a very attractive green belt area that provides a buffer zone from the urban developments of Ty Fry and Foundrytown.

As far as consistency is concerned I do not think that there has been any regard to other relevant plans, policies or strategies relating to the area or adjoining areas. The Dare Valley Country Park has recently been adopted as one of the main tourist attractions in Rhondda Cynon Taff and has just received a substantial grant from the Heads of the Valley regeneration fund to establish Dare Valley as a strategic satellite tourist centre to attracting visitors off the Heads of the Valleys into exploring the wider benefits of the Borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accssn No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4047.A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**  

**Policy:** Site: 1026/ASS017  

**Summary:**  

**Issue:**  

**PEX Session:** Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Representation Text**

1. **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.

2. **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.

---
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### Representation Detail

**by:** Representation No

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

**Filtered to show:** (All representations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep’n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4048.A1</td>
<td>0 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:**
- **Site:** 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. 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**

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.

**Reply**

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.

---
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1. **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.

2. **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 Text**

**Rep'n No** | **Accssn No** | **Date Lodged** | **Late?** | **Source Type** | **Mode** | **Status** | **Modified** | **Petition of** | **in parts** | **Add'l** | **SA/SEA** | **Repr Council** | **Officer** | **Recommendation** | **Response**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
4048.A2 | O | M | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
### Representative Detail

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

1. **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.

2. **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.
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

1.3 - 4

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: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

2.5

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.
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 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.

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

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4051.A1</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document: Map: Policy: Site: 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

Summary:

**Item Question** 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** 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>TREAT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>NO FRTHR EVID.</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4051.A2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road  PEX Session:  

**Summary:**  

**Issue:**  

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**  

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 afforables 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.
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 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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>No Further Evidence</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4052.A2</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy:** Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Map:** Policy: Site

**Site:** 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. 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 affordable 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.

2. 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 affordable 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 Text

**Issue:** 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 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 Penypych 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** | **Representation Text**
--- | ---
1 3 - 4 | Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

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 Penypych mountain and borders Penypych 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.

---
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13 - 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.

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 afforables 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
Representations

**Representation Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suggested use for the housing including a substantial proportion of affordables is not supported by a proven need in this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This submission fails all the CE2 tests of soundness and is not based upon robust and credible evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Policy AW1 is already vastly oversubscribed in the Northern Area against the Wales Spatial Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Policy NSA9 already has a full allocation of Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) There is no proven need in this area for affordables Policy NSA11, indeed there is already an access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan encourages a Healthy Lifestyle. This area is home to allotments and Pigeon Lofts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Text**

**Item Question**: 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**: 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.*
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.
--- | ---
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 afforables 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.
**Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan**
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<table>
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**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:**
- **Site:** 918/ASN024
- **Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road**

**Summary:**

- **Issue:**
- **PEX Session:**

**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**

```
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.
```

---
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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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4057.A1</td>
<td>O M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:**

**Site:** 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

**PEX Session:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
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.

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.
### Item Question
**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 who 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
**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.
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.

---

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.
### Summary:

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 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.

### Soundness Tests

1. **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 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.

2. **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 affordable 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.
**Item Question**  
1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
   
   The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhomdda 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 affordable 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 Blaenrhomdda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhomdda. 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 Blaenrhomdda 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 Blaenrhomdda Road’ being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.

**Item Question**  
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 affordable 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 Penp Mig mountain and borders Penp Mig 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.
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 affordable 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.

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 affordable 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 Penyph mountain and borders Penyph 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.
### Summary:

The site lies behind and overshadows the houses on Blaenrhonddda Road. Its topography is a steep mountainside area, at present home to Allotments and Pigeon Lofts and with footpaths crossing the site.

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 Blaenrhonddda Road is already a major hazard in the village of Blaenrhonddda. 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 Blaenrhonddda 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 Blaenrhonddda Road’ being included under Policy NSA-9 and suggested amendment to the settlement Boundary AS(S)17 under Policy NSA-12.

### Soundness Tests

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

**Policy:** Site: 1026/ASS017  Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road  
**PEX Session:** 

#### Representation Text

**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.

Tackling 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.

#### Soundness Tests

**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.
**Representations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>in parts</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Repr Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4062.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

- **Map:**
- **Policy:**
- **Site:** 918/ASN024 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road

**Summary:**

**Issue:**

1. **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.

2. **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.
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.

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.
**Issues:**

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.

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 No:** 4063.A2  
**Access No:** OM  
**Date Lodged:** 12/11/2009  
**Source Type:** Map  
**Mode Status:**  
**Modified:**  
**Treat Petition of:**  
**Evidence in parts:**  
**No Further Evidence SA/SEA Rep Council:**  
**Recommendation:**  
**Response:**  

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 1026/ASS017 Land to the rear of Blaenrhondda Road  
**Summary:**  
**Issue:**  
**PEX Session:**  
**Item Question:** Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?  
**Representation Text:**  
- 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:** Why incl/excl of site improves soundness?  
**Reply:** 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 Text**

**Item Question**: 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**: 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. This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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. This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scheme with its conceptual drawings was submitted with the representation along with a sustainability appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
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### Policy: Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site

### Summary:

**Issue:**

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.

### Soundness Tests

**Item Question:** 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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 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 with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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 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 with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accsnn No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4071.A1</td>
<td>S M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site

**Summary:**

**Item Question**: 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**: 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.
### Item Question 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 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.
### Item Question: 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: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.  |
| 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 then 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.  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scheme with its conceptual drawings was submitted with the representation along with a sustainability appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 then their own space within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Question** | 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** | 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.
**Item Question** 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** 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scheme with its conceptual drawings was submitted with the representation along with a sustainability appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Representation Text**
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**Document:** Map: Policy:  
**Site:** 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site  
**Summary:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
### Item Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Accssn No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of in parts</th>
<th>Add'l SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4083.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Map: Policy: Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site

**Policy:** Map: Issue:

**Summary:**

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soundness Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/11/2009
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.

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 then their own space within the community.

This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.
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, Blaenhondda 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.

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 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 with its basic policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scheme with its conceptual drawings was submitted with the representation along with a sustainability appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Soundness Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Question</td>
<td>Representation Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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 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 with its basic policies. |
**Representation Detail**

| Representation No | Access No | Date Lodged | Late? | Source Type | Mode Status | Modified | SA/SEA | Officer | Rep Council | Recommendation | Response |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------|-------------|---------------|-----------|----------|
| 4089.A1           |           |             |       |             |             |          |        |         |             |               |           |          |

**Document:**

- Site: 1019/ASN025
- Former Stelco Hardy Site

**Policy:**

- Map: Site

**Issue:**

- Soundness Tests

**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.

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.
**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.

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 Text

**Item Question**: 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**: 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 Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4 Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5 Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
<td>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. This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text:**

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: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Representation Text:**

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.
**Item Question** | **Representation Text** | **Soundness Tests**
---|---|---
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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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. This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep'n No</td>
<td>Accssn No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096.A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:** Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site

**Policy:**

**Summary:**

**Item Question**

1. 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.  
   
   Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.

**Representation Text**

**Item Question**

2. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
### Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council Local Development Plan

**Rep'n No**: 4098.A1

**Document**: Map: Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site

**Policy**: Map: Issue:

**Summary**: 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**: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?

**Representation Text**: 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**: Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?

**Soundness Tests**: 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep'n No</th>
<th>Access No</th>
<th>Date Lodged</th>
<th>Late?</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Mode Status</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Petition of</th>
<th>Add'l</th>
<th>SA/SEA</th>
<th>Rep Council</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4099.A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document:**

**Map:**

**Policy:** Site: 1019/ASN025 Former Stelco Hardy Site

---

**Item Question**

**Representation Text**

1. **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**

2. **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.
The land north of Talygarn House has been promoted as a potential allocation for “mixed use” and residential development, (although the mixed use element is not defined). Objections are submitted to any further development within the Talygarn Conservation Area.

The site is not appropriate for such development due to the importance of the former hospital and estate. The original mansion is a grade II listed building, several other structures in the gardens are grade II listed and the grounds as a whole are registered by CADW for the special historic interest.

In addition, the site lies within a special landscape area as defined in the Taff Ely Local Plan and which is now proposed to be extended within the LDP. This designation is supported. The alternative site is a greenfield site and is wholly unsuitable for further development.

The site is also considered to be in an unsuitable location. With no facilities within the site existing and potential future residents would be wholly reliant on private vehicles for travel and whilst there is a suggestion that new facilities could be incorporated into any mixed use development, the viability of any such facilities must be questionable.

In addition to the above, there must be more detailed concerns with regards to highways and access. Around 80 dwellings were approved and have been developed as part of the redevelopment of the former Talygarn Hospital/Mansion and there are (approximately) an additional 20 dwellings within the former Talygarn estate. All are served by narrow access, substandard lanes where it is only possible for two vehicles to pass with care. The existing access roads within Talygarn are so narrow (and serve the equestrian centre) that it is difficult for two cars to pass. Additional traffic can only exacerbate the problem. The lanes are extensively used and have exceeded their design capacity.

The exclusion of this site (AS(N)32) would improve the soundness of the LDP and is based on sound evidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. |
| 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.
--- | ---
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 then 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Representation Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3 - 4</td>
<td>Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The site being central to the three villages of Blaencau, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therefore allocation for Community Use and Employment is the only viable option for this site and I support its inclusion in this category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Question</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would reinforce the Rhondda Cynon Taf Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category makes the LDP much more robust and achievable and contributes to its soundness, not conflicts with its basic policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**Document:**

- Map: [Map]
- Policy: [Policy]
- Site: 1019/ASN025  Former Stelco Hardy Site

**Summary:**

- Item Question: Support (Yes) or object (No) to incl of site?
- Representation Text:

> 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:**

- Why Incl/Excl of site improves soundness?
- Reply:

> 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.