1. Purpose of Report

1.1 To seek approval to adopt the Pencoed Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to the adopted Bridgend Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Plan / Other Corporate Priorities

2.1 The development of a Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan for Pencoed is linked to the Strong Communities theme of the Community Strategy and the Corporate Improvement Plan.

3. Background

3.1 The strategy was endorsed by Cabinet on the 7th September 2010 who referred the document to the Development Control Committee for consideration and to issue it for consultation in order to give it material weight in the land-use planning decision making process.

3.2 Given the desirability of further public consultation on the strategy and adopting the strategy as Supplementary Planning Guidance, on the 23rd September 2010 the Development Control Committee resolved to approve the Pencoed Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan as the basis for public consultation; authorised officers to make appropriate arrangements for public consultation; and to await a further report on the outcome of the consultation process.

3.2 A 6-week period of public consultation was held between 21st October 2010 and 3rd December 2010. The consultation was advertised in the following ways:

- A statutory notice was placed in the Glamorgan Gazette on the 21st October 2010.
- Information on the strategy and consultation was contained in an article within the Pencoed Bulletin which was delivered to every household in the Pencoed area in mid to late October.
- A staffed public exhibition was held in the Pencoed Welfare Hall on the 29th and 30th October 2010.
- A press release was also issued at the start of the consultation.
- The consultation documents were available for inspection with representation forms at Pencoed Library and at the Planning Department, Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend.
Information on the consultation, including all documentation and representation forms was placed on the Council’s website.
A copy of the draft SPG was sent to over 100 targeted consultees including planning consultants and statutory undertakers with details on how to respond.
Letters were sent to other relevant organisations, including local equalities groups, advising them of the consultation and how to respond.

4. Current Situation

4.1 By the end of the consultation period 33 representations were received on the draft SPG. These representations have been summarised in Appendix 1 to this report. Copies of the full representations are held at the Planning Department, and can be viewed by Members on request.

4.2 Appendix 1 also sets out a reasoned response, a suggested decision and, where appropriate, proposed changes to the SPG, for each representation received.

4.3 As well as these comments the consultation form asked specific questions related to the vision, objectives and projects in the strategy and if they were supported or not. The responses are recorded in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree with Vision that has been developed for the Strategy?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree with the Objectives that have been developed for the Strategy?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you support or disagree with the following projects?</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi User Games Area (MUGA)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard / BMX Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Shelter</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Underage Drinking Campaign</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Links</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Pencoed</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencoed Welfare Hall</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Retail Development</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Employment Routes</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Former Surgery Site</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIY Streets - Incidental Spaces</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey's Public Realm Improvements</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway Project</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penprysg Road Footway Improvements</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Car Park</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Crossing Pedestrian Shelters</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penybont Rd / Penprysg Bridge Junction</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% do not add up to 100 is some circumstances as no response was received in some circumstances
On 16th December 2010, the Development Control Committee considered all of the representations up to that time and agreed changes to be made to the document in light of the comments made. In summary, the main areas of change in the document arising from the public consultation responses are as follows:

- Inclusion of more information in the strategy as to how the individual projects will work together to improve the retail environment by reducing traffic flows through the centre of Pencoed.
- The objectives of the strategy be revised to include reference to the maintenance of the character of Pencoed.
- Amend the strategy to introduce a degree of flexibility on commercial schemes to ensure they are realistic and deliverable.
- Reflect in more detail in the text of the document those elements of the projects which are illustrated in the concept plans in the draft strategy.

Subsequent to that Committee, 3 further representations were received, 2 of which made further comments. For completeness these have been added to Appendix 1. As a result of these representations it is recommended that Council makes the following further amendment:

- The housing objective be reworded to be more realistic given the growth context within the UDP and LDP.

All of the above changes are now incorporated as amendments to the SPG attached at Appendix 2.

Following these procedures and public consultation, the Council is now formally requested to adopt the document as Supplementary Planning Guidance to the UDP.

Effect upon Policy Framework& Procedure Rules.

The Pencoed Regeneration Strategy will complement the adopted Bridgend Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and Fit for the Future: Regeneration Strategy for Bridgend County Borough.

Effect upon Policy Framework& Procedure Rules.

Equalities Impact Assessment.

An Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) has been undertaken. The Strategy is designed to enhance Pencoed – socially, economically and environmentally for the community as a whole. There was consultation with the local community prior to the preparation of the Strategy to gain views on attitudes to Pencoed and to identify which areas were most in need of improvement and the Strategy aims to address these matters. A specific action point of the EQIA was to ensure that equality groups are specifically informed of the further consultation taking place; this was undertaken.

It is recognised that the implementation of individual priority projects of the Strategy has the potential to affect different groups in different ways, with beneficial positive impacts and some potentially negative impacts. The group most likely to be affected are younger people as five of the projects are directly targeted at them. It is acknowledged that further work and EQIA on individual components of the Strategy,
will be required as the strategy moves towards implementation to ensure that positive impacts are maximised and potential negative impacts addressed and minimised.

7. **Financial Implications.**

7.1 Each individual project listed in the strategy has an estimated budgetary cost and potential funding sources associated with it. However the delivery of each project will be dependent upon funding being made available and cannot be guaranteed. This is especially so given the continuing pressure on regeneration funding from the Welsh Assembly Government. However, once in place, the very presence of the Strategy will enable grants and funding opportunities to be accessed more easily when they become available.

8. **Recommendations**

8.1 It is recommended that Council:-

8.1.1 Adopts the Pencoed Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan (Appendix 2) as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to the adopted Bridgend Unitary Development Plan.

8.1.2 Agrees that the SPG, in its adopted form, be published in hard-copy and on the Council’s website.

Louise Fradd  
Corporate Director - Communities  
5th January 2011

Contact Officer: Stuart A Ingram  
Principal Planning Officer (Development Planning)

Telephone: (01656) 643165

E-mail: stuart.ingram@bridgend.gov.uk

Postal Address  
Regeneration and Development, Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend, CF31 4WB

Background documents

Draft Pencoed Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan

Representations received to draft Pencoed Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan during public consultation

Planning File Reference: 312A163
### Appendix 1 – Pencoed Regeneration Strategy Supplementary Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Reasoned response</th>
<th>Decision and Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. Williams</td>
<td>Pleased that the authorities are working together to improve the town of Pencoed.</td>
<td>Support Welcomed</td>
<td>No action to be taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencoed Inhabitant</td>
<td>I do not entirely agree as I do not agree that the town requires (nor that it will benefit from) the development of additional retail premises over and above those that already exist. They would be unsustainable. I do not agree that the town requires additional retail premises to be built. There already exists &quot;A key local convenience role&quot;, provided by the CO-OP store and small independent retailers e.g. butchers and post office. Those existing stores (and eg. pharmacies) would be put out of business if a new retailer such as Tesco or similar was introduced and it would change the character of Pencoed for the worse. No additional retail premises should be developed. It would ruin the ‘village’ character of Pencoed, which the vast majority of inhabitants wish to retain and it would result in Pencoed becoming a one retailer offering if a new supermarket chain development such as Tesco was allowed. A skateboard/bmx park should not take up existing green area - it should be moved to be near the Pencoed swimming pool. The little amount of existing green area should be retained. Also, no new town car park is needed. It would encourage more cars.</td>
<td>The strategy responds to both the professional opinion of the commercial surveyor advising on the study and feedback from members of the public and retail operators. The proposals for further retail units are based on the reported demand from some of the larger retailers and the assessed need to provide retail floor space in the town which meets the demands of retailers (DDA etc) and those of a population the size of Pencoed. In terms of sustainability, it is considered that current practices of people travelling outside of the town to shop are not sustainable in themselves. It is considered that through careful design new development can be implemented to retain the ‘village’ feel of Pencoed.</td>
<td>Objective No. 4 to be strengthened to include reference to a need to maintain the ‘Character’ of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If pedestrian shelters are to be provided by the railway level crossing they should be small, unobtrusive, not obstruct pedestrian walkways and be in neutral colours fitting with the buildings nearby. Despite the population size, Pencoed inhabitants enjoy the ‘village’ character that exists and the Council should not try to change that simply because town planning theory may suggest differently based on population size.</td>
<td>The proposed town centre car park returns this area to its former use and provides a more substantial car park for users of the town centre. The design of the shelters is a consideration for the detailed planning stage.</td>
<td>Strategy be amended so that reference the fact that the shelters will be unobtrusive etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. James</td>
<td>A youth shelter - proposed location has no CCTV coverage, important that any area like this is closely monitored. Youth facilities to be distributed evenly throughout the town, rather than all being placed in the Felindre area. This is view of youth response in report also this site for the MUGA is not visible from the road - for safety and surveillance purpose the Min-Y-Nant site would be easier for parents and PCSO's to survey. Reference to &quot;Former Tennis Courts&quot; is totally inaccurate. These courts are heavily used in the summer months - Why would this Strategy recommend taking away a valuable asset to adults and the youth of Pencoed.</td>
<td>Final decision on location will be made in partnership with the Police, Pencoed’s younger generation and various other organisations. The strategy approach is to distribute youth provision more evenly throughout Pencoed. Agree – change to be made.</td>
<td>Strengthen report text to reflect the considerations that will determine the final location of the site. Report to be updated to read ‘Tennis Courts’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D. Barnes | 1. Re-prioritise traffic lights between set of lights by post office side and library side to discourage through traffic from Coychurch Road and encourage traffic flow past library from college roundabout.  
2. Create 'residents only' parking lay by on Hendre Road prior to junction with Llwyn Gwern and "yellow line" to exclude parking outside properties from junction with inner ring road to inc. with Llwyn Gwern. | A review of the prioritisation of these lights will be required in the context of all the traffic / transport projects proposed.  
The issue of parking in some localised areas of Pencoed is recognised as being of a concern to residents.  
This issue may be addressed in a review of the Traffic Regulation Orders in relation to civil parking enforcement. Enforcement is an area which is outside of the general remit of the strategy.  
However, parked vehicles in the road can be seen as an effective way to reduce speed. The introduction of a reduced speed limit will not necessarily deter the 'boy racers' the respondent refers to; it could have the opposite effect. | Text in strategy to be strengthened to more clearly detail that a review of the prioritisation of these lights as a priority.  
Bullet point list to be added to outline what measures the project could include (e.g. right turn filter, bring forward stop lines) |
This simple modification will encourage traffic flow plus place a 20mph speed limit on Hendre Road.

FURTHER RESPONSE RECEIVED

1. Penprysk Bridge Junction Traffic Light System

One major problem not addressed in the strategy is the amount of pollution and congestion produced by through traffic experienced on a daily basis. The reason for this is that the 'easy' option to enter the Hendre area of the town is though the main shopping street up to the traffic lights which currently 'favour' those vehicles which have made progress through the town. This 'progress' has in the main been down Felindre Road (creating a queue at the 'black spot' t-junction with Coychurch Road) and along Coychurch Road having passed the Comprehensive School. Further, this same traffic has on occasions, rejected the 'opportunity' of joining the queue to cross the Level Crossing and made a dangerous manoeuvre in overtaking the queue. The reason for this 'excess' traffic is quite obvious ...

The Penprysk Bridge junction has four distinct traffic flows but is controlled by just three sets of lights. Along the main through route, passing the Post Office from the Coychurch end and the Library from the Brynna / Pencoed College end traffic - from the Cowbridge direction currently has the best chance of progressing over the bridge before the lights change to red again. If there are more than 12 vehicles in this queue outside the Post Office then those queuing from the other direction have no opportunity to proceed legally and must take their chance when the lights turn to red. This crazy situation can be observed each and every day.

There is a way to resolve the matter which to my mind cannot wait until the regeneration strategy becomes reality.

Pollution in monitored throughout the County Borough by the Air Quality Management scheme; the Pencoed area is not currently identified as an area of concern.

The lights at this junction are reviewed on a regular basis and are operating as efficiently as possible given the current system in place.

The introduction of a green filter needs to be undertaken in the context of all the other projects included in the strategy as these will have a knock-on effect to traffic direction and flows.
Quite simply put in place equipment that will control the lights in 4 distinct phases and at the same time favour those vehicles queuing from the college side of the bridge. Drivers will very soon realise that the quickest method of progressing over the bridge is to initially to by-pass the town on the dual carriageway up to the college roundabout – this is turn would reduce the quantity of traffic and the resultant pollution in the town centre.

2. Hendre Road Intermittent “One Way System”

Parked vehicles outside properties situated between the traffic lights at the end of the inner by-pass and the junction with Llwyn Gwern cause major frustration to drivers and on many occasion generate dangerous situations. Vehicles jostle for any advantage that will allow them to make progress in either direction causing ‘near misses’ every day.

Opposite the houses is a large grassed area (common land?). The way to resolve this major problem (which has become much worse since the Redrow Estate was constructed) is to build a ‘Residents Only Lay-bye’ limited to ‘Permit Holders ’ only and “double yellow line” the side of Hendre Road outside the noted properties. This simple step would immediately free up traffic flow and improve safety. There may be some who have fears of speeding traffic along the road – their concerns may well be justified. In that case simply make the whole of Hendre Road a 20 mph zone – something that should be done in any case to slow down the increasing numbers of ‘boy racers’ many localities have to put up with these days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quite simply put in place equipment that will control the lights in 4 distinct phases and at the same time favour those vehicles queuing from the college side of the bridge. Drivers will very soon realise that the quickest method of progressing over the bridge is to initially to by-pass the town on the dual carriageway up to the college roundabout – this is turn would reduce the quantity of traffic and the resultant pollution in the town centre.</th>
<th>See comments above.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Hendre Road Intermittent “One Way System”</td>
<td>Parked vehicles outside properties situated between the traffic lights at the end of the inner by-pass and the junction with Llwyn Gwern cause major frustration to drivers and on many occasion generate dangerous situations. Vehicles jostle for any advantage that will allow them to make progress in either direction causing ‘near misses’ every day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposite the houses is a large grassed area (common land?). The way to resolve this major problem (which has become much worse since the Redrow Estate was constructed) is to build a ‘Residents Only Lay-bye’ limited to ‘Permit Holders ’ only and “double yellow line” the side of Hendre Road outside the noted properties. This simple step would immediately free up traffic flow and improve safety. There may be some who have fears of speeding traffic along the road – their concerns may well be justified. In that case simply make the whole of Hendre Road a 20 mph zone – something that should be done in any case to slow down the increasing numbers of ‘boy racers’ many localities have to put up with these days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Wildig</td>
<td>The retail area designated needs to respond to achievability in the light of ownerships which can affect deliverability and respond to current planning consents/applications. There are other development opportunities which should be identified and included in strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R J Hancock</td>
<td>Consider realigning road at the monument to create a mini roundabout or even a full scale roundabout incorporating the monument as the centre of the roundabout to allow access to all roads thus removing the 'no right turn' at the monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Evatt</td>
<td>Travel by public transport difficult on Sundays. Not convinced that retail units on Penybont Road will gain necessary tenants to re-energise the retail units, parking outside both schools an issue. Am unhappy about the cost of sending the &quot;special bulletin&quot; to every house and business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Todd</td>
<td>More focus on town High Street/ - Make pull in a formal short stay - Signs and lighting to car parks Encourage shops not to have metal shutters, looks like closed town on evening. With camera on shops should be no need to have such security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Edwards</td>
<td>Please look at details like adequate rubbish bins and monitoring of littering which during term time is a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Jones</td>
<td>Improvements to shop facades e.g. shutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thomas</td>
<td>I still think we need to do more to try and make apathetic people take an interest. Provide bins for dog muck and provide a warden to make people pick up litter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike Design</td>
<td>Whilst our Client has no objection to you showing a possible redevelopment of the site, and we understand your logic in suggesting a new development to act as a magnet to that end of the retail area, there appears to be significant difficulties in the way of bringing about the sort of development you envisage as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a fundamental level, demolition of the existing and rebuilding could only be privately financed if a substantial pre-let was in place. It seems to us that the possibility of achieving this is very remote.

From what you say significant grant funding is unlikely to be available for a project like this, despite there being 50% grants available for relatively minor upgrading works.

We have previously approached the highway authority regarding access in the position shown on your plan and have been told it would be unacceptable due to its proximity to the signal controlled junction.

Site levels are such that the existing street level shops have an empty basement below them. Moving the building back on the site would compound this further.

However, if you become aware of circumstances that could help overcome these difficulties please let me know.

---

Welsh Water

In principle we support your SPG document however, we have the following comments/observations, which we would like you to consider when reviewing your draft SPG.

We would like to see included a note on when designing buildings (residential and non residential) that due consideration should be given to include in the design where feasible water efficiency fittings which can reduce energy cost and thus give savings.

Development proposals should take into account the impact of surface water drainage and accordingly include measures to acceptably manage its disposal.

These considerations are considered to be a matter for the detailed design stages of any project. The requirements outlined are reflected in other national and local level planning policy / guidance.

No action / change proposed.
Encouragement should be given to the inclusion of soakaways, sustainable drainage systems, green/alternative roofs and other measures to minimise and control surface run-off as part of the development proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Issue/Concern</th>
<th>Strategy Consideration</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr J J Dyer</td>
<td>Speed and rail crossing.</td>
<td>Strategy has considered issues and looks to address wherever possible.</td>
<td>No action / change proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G. Watts</td>
<td>Transport and movement - The improved access across the railway is not addressed. The level crossing point is still in its dilapidated state and dangerous. Economy and Enterprise - I'm told that the business rates are no encouragement for small businesses to move into Pencoed. More real help is needed to smarten up the town centre. Too much red tape and rules for fledgling businesses. * The kerb built-outs in Penybont Road will only serve to jam up traffic down stream in Coychurch Road trying to access through The level crossing. * Force Network Rail to rectify The damaged level crossing. * Can someone provide written proof to us Pencoed rate payers that this (and future improving developments) regeneration scheme does not attract EU improvement Funding - Has anybody asked For it? If not - Why Not? * Provision of a dedicated youth club/facility with full time professional staff.</td>
<td>This issue is one for Network Rail and was not considered achievable for inclusion in the strategy. CIA Grants are available and rates within Pencoed are considered attractive, particularly given the population of the town. National planning policy seeks to prioritise pedestrian and cyclist movement and safety over that of vehicular traffic. One aim of the strategy is to remove inappropriate traffic from out of the town centre, improving the environment etc. Appropriate funding sources will be explored at the implementation stage of the project and will include consideration of a wide range of grants from various funding sources. The youth facility is now open within the town.</td>
<td>No action / change proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategy text will be updated and amended to include a description of how the numerous highway improvements will work together strategically to create a more attractive environment in the centre of Pencoed.
| Mrs A P Watts | Rail crossing problems not addressed, I consider this a problem that needs solving sooner rather than later.  
Rents/rates need reviewing to encourage more retail and businesses.  
The amount of litter that appears after the school lunch breaks needs drastically reducing (more bins) | This issue is one for Network Rail and was not considered achievable for inclusion in the strategy.  
The rates in the town are considered attractive, however, the quality and type of unit is considered a barrier to attracting 'high street' names.  
This is considered to be outside of the general scope of the strategy. | No action / changes proposed. |

* A new access point/bridge over the railway.  
* A new/improved access road from Hendre to Coity Bypass.  
* This current scheme is only cosmetic to the current infrastructure/facilities. It offers no relief to the unemployed, pensioners, access to shops/services.  
* Make Penybont Road from lights to Coychurch Road one way only to southbound traffic.  

Points are not specific and considered to be unachievable in the current economic climate / without significant population growth.  
The projects / schemes are considered realistic and achievable within the timescales set. Projects include pre-employment routes for those unemployed and looks to improve the range / quality of retail provision while improving access through a review of key routes and the provision of a town centre car park.  
This would have a detrimental impact on bus routes / timetable. The proposed scheme looks to discourage rather than restrict northwards flow.
| Mr P Adams | Do we need more shops, when there are lots of empty ones already? Redevelop those first. Sort out the level crossing and rail bridge.  
Make another junction from the motorway to take traffic into west side of the town. Move the monument to the otherside of the road, put a roundabout in, this would slow the traffic down through the town. | Strategy market research suggests the demand is there within the town, however, the quality of units does not meet this demand. The strategy therefore looks to improve the quality and size of the units in order to re-energise the town’s retail provision. The level crossing / rail bridge are considered unachievable as projects without significant population growth to generate the required funding. The Strategy was written to be implemented in a low population growth scenario. This proposal is considered unrealistic in the current climate and is contrary to WAG policy.  
Current proposals being developed by BCBC Highways look to address traffic issues around the monument. |  |
| MRS S DAVIES | The main flaw is the new traffic layout in the town centre. One of the biggest issues for Pencoed residents at the moment is the movement of traffic through the town. As I see it the two main causes are the level crossing and the single lane bridge crossing on Penprysg Road being the alternative railway crossing. I was told that priority will be given to Southbound traffic on the main road passed the shops. Apparently the objective being to dissuade people from driving through that area. That is completely ridiculous. The aim of the strategy's projects in relation to highways is to discourage inappropriate traffic in the centre of Pencoed and to encourage movement around the town to the east on the A473 and for access to be gained from the north.  
The strategy text will be updated and amended to include a description of how the numerous highway improvements will work together strategically to create a more attractive environment in the centre of Pencoed. |  |
In order to access properties over the level crossing residents only have two options and in most cases they need to use this road not only to get to and from home but to get to the shops. I have said it before and I will say it again a car park 10 minutes walk to the shops is not suitable. Shoppers need to park where they can nip in and buy odds and ends. Not park up for a mornings shopping. Dissuading cars from the town centre is just asking for businesses to close down. Priority should also be given to northbound traffic to allay any problems with snarling up when the barrier is down and during peak hours.

- Of course there is still the issue of traffic turning right onto Penprysg Road when approaching the traffic lights from the College side. Surely the answer to all of these problems would have been to widen the bridge at the top of Pencoed thus relieving all possible long tailbacks from all directions. However I am told this will not be possible due to cost.

Why then oh why is there no filter or a four way setting at these lights for making a right turn when approaching from the college. Drivers constantly have to turn on a red light. I am told this is not part of the regeneration but down to Bridgend Highways so this could be brought into effect immediately and this would relieve traffic approaching northbound past the shops when coming off the motorway as traffic would use the road from the college straight away as they will not have to worry about turning right on a red light.

| A range of parking options have been included in the strategy. These include provision of a shoppers car park for people to park up to undertake linked trips through the town centre. Not only will this address a current deficit in provision it will also encourage people to stay in the centre of Pencoed, boosting the vitality of the area and its attractiveness for further private sector investment. It is also proposed to regularise parking in the lay by in the town centre to enable very short trips to be undertaken. |
| The lights at this junction are reviewed on a regular basis and are operating as efficiently as possible given the current system in place. |
| The introduction of a green filter needs to be undertaken in the context of all the other projects included in the strategy as these will have a knock-on effect to traffic direction and flows. |
Another issue for the residents is the state of the main road through the town. How exactly do you propose to upgrade the streets and footpaths. Very little was made of this when I queried it at the exhibition and I was told there are plans to upgrade the footpaths and lights however only in certain parts of the town centre i.e. where the traffic calming schemes are. Any one knows that regeneration is not simply a re-organisation but an upgrade as well. Please look at Talbot Greens model. I also suggested at the exhibition that local businesses should have to tidy up the front of their premises and remove the large wheely bins that they persist in leaving permanently at the front of their shops. The worst offenders are the shops adjacent to the traffic lights. Just requesting that businesses do this is not enough it should be enforced. Once again I was told at the exhibition that this was a council problem not a regeneration issue. Totally ridiculous again. These go hand in hand with regeneration. Is there no one out there with any common sense. To make Pencoed more pleasant and attractive these changes should be high on the Council’s list. Maesteg and Porthcawl have been upgraded so why should Pencoed miss out.

- Finally Hendre Road is a big problem area in Pencoed. Some residents ask for traffic calming measures on this road. However there is already a traffic calming measure on this road and it is not one installed by BCBC. Residents parking on this road is the cause of constant hold up especially at peak hours. A simple answer to this is to make resident parking available opposite their houses by using a small area of the green. Having spoken to several residents on that road they all agreed traffic calming is not the answer especially given the number of properties at the end of the village and already being held up at the level crossing. In fact any traffic calming would only serve to dissuade people from wanting to live at that end of the village.

Commercial Improvement Grants are available to those businesses in Pencoed who wish to improve their properties. However despite promotion of the scheme to every shop within the designated area, take up of the grant has been extremely low.

Enforcement of this issue is difficult. However, with the regeneration of the physical fabric of the town centre proposed as part of the strategy, it is envisaged that the general improvement of the area will encourage greater responsibility and pride from private businesses to both upgrade their premises but keep their waste bins within their properties.

The issue of parking in some localised areas of Pencoed is recognised as being of a concern to residents.

This issue may be addressed in a review of the Traffic Regulation Orders in relation to civil parking enforcement. Enforcement is an area which is outside of the general remit of the strategy.

However, parked vehicles in the road can be seen as an effective way to reduce speed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs A Aston</th>
<th>Any regeneration of Pencoed has to be an improvement at the moment it is slowly dying.</th>
<th>Agree – comment appreciated.</th>
<th>No action / change proposed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr S. Powell</td>
<td>Plans as published &quot;Item 8&quot; give the impression of a one way traffic system between the R.A.O0B Club and the Welfare Hall. Also two disabled parking bays in front of the R.A.O.B. Club. This is on land not owned or controlled by the developer.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Report to be updated to reflect land ownership and recent proposed development. Plans to be amended accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thompson</td>
<td>Our concern, at present, relates to the &quot;Town Centre Carpark&quot;; specifically the proposal to provide an access/egress roadway to the side of the Welfare Hall and between the Welfare Hall and our premises. The documentation we have viewed gives the distinct impression that the only land/property owner who would be involved in this project would be Valleys to Coast. This is incorrect as the land between our premises and the Welfare Hall, across which this roadway would pass, is partly owned by us. Consequently can you please confirm that you are fully aware of the correct situation regarding ownership? We must advise that should the proposal progress we will object in the strongest possible terms.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Report to be updated to reflect land ownership and recent proposed development. Plans to be amended accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs P. Owen</td>
<td>I have no knowledge of the 'Vision'. I have no knowledge of the 'Objectives' Noise surveys of existing sites elsewhere need to be undertaken before deciding on suitable of proposed sites. i. Improved policy of any proposed project sites involving youths is essential. ii. These areas need to be lit at night.</td>
<td>It is considered the vision / objectives are clear within the consultation material.</td>
<td>No change / action proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any additional surveys would be undertaken through the planning process. Facilities for youth proposed within the strategy are not proposed as 24hr facilities and therefore are unlikely to be lit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| J. Davies | Could consideration be given to disabled parking.  
There is no provision in the town at all (apart from the Welfare Hall exclusively for users of the Hall). The layby in Penybont Road says ‘No Parking At Any Time’ but no one takes any notice.  
The Highways Department indicated that ‘Blue Badge’ holders are entitled to park in the lay by outside/opposite chemist (for prescriptions) but can never get into the space. |
|---|---|
| Consideration to be given to inclusion of disabled parking within the regeneration area.  
Parking standards require disabled spaces in all new public car parks and publicly-accessible buildings. |
| Reference to the disabled parking requirements will be included within the final strategy.  
The situation in the lay by will be reviewed. |
| Pencoed Primary PTA | I would like to draw your attention to the road safety concerns of the parents of pupils at Pencoed Primary School and hope that you will take this into consideration for your plans regarding the future of Pencoed.  
In particular parents are concerned about the lack of a pavement at the top of Penprysg Road. This means that the school and the PTA feel uncomfortable about promoting walking to school since there is effectively NO safe route to walk to school. In our opinion, a pavement must be an urgent priority. I hope that there will be a safe bypassing footpath through the new surgery and car parks. The current traffic light system over the railway bridge encourages pedestrians to "risk" crossing the road since the green man is on strict rotation rather than given priority at peak times.  
There is a shortage of parking around the school which may be eased by extending the existing car park into the presently unused grass area around the playground. We also recommend re-painting the carpark to encourage drivers to park within spaces so that the space is most efficiently utilised.  
Parents feel that they have no choice but to park around the area of the school causing road safety concerns and unrest with the residents of the area. Some potential solutions to this problem that have been suggested are: |
| This is recognised as a problem throughout the County Borough. Each year all schools are encouraged to apply for Safe Routes to Schools / Safe Routes in Communities funding via the Welsh Assembly Government and the provision of a School Travel Plan.  
One of the primary objectives of this would be to reduce unnecessary car journeys to and from the school which could alleviate the current congestion problems.  
The PTA are therefore invited to progress this matter.  
Many of the solutions suggested by the PTA could be included within a strong Safe Routes In Communities bid to the Welsh Assembly Government.  
Schools are invited to initiate this work by the Council on an annual basis. This was last undertaken by a letter to head teachers on the 29th September 2010. |
| No change / action proposed to Final Strategy. |
- A residents parking permit scheme - residents understand the need for "loading and unloading" parking at 9am and 3pm but parents and staff often park in the area all day to ensure their space causing issues for elderly residents and/or those with young children.

- Widening the existing road into the "double" pavement so that cars are parked on the road rather than on the pavement, the current "double pavement" encourages cars to be parked on the pavement and immediately causes poor road safety procedures.

- Creating a one-way system along Wimbbourne Road.

- Other traffic calming measures along Penprysg Road including a 20mph speed limit and a flashing light showing the speed of passing cars.

Environment Agency Wales  

We support the proposed regeneration scheme for the Pencoed area and having reviewed the document we offer the following comments.

**Flooding and Surface Water**  
A number of the proposed sites mentioned within this plan are located within areas considered to be at fluvial flood risk from the either the Nant Heol y Geifr or the River Ewenny (main Rivers).

Any proposals within the areas of considered flood risk will require an Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) to be carried-out. This will ensure that the proposals can comply with the requirements of TAN15.

All developments should incorporate a sustainable drainage system (SUDS) when dealing with surface water, although we recognise that contamination may restrict the type of SUD used. The variety of SUDS techniques available means support for the regeneration strategy is welcomed.

The detailed issues relating to flooding, surface water, land contamination, groundwater, biodiversity / ecology and the Water Framework Directive will be addressed at the implementation stage of each project in the strategy where appropriate.

No change / action proposed.
that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles.

Land Contamination
We are not aware of any specific land contamination issues within the area for regeneration. However, we would welcome the reuse of any brownfield sites as a priority over greenfield sites.

Groundwater
Parts of the proposed development area lie within a Source Protection Zone 1 for the Schywll source. This area is part of this source as it is karstic limestone that is connected to the abstraction point further downstream.

Under the Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice; Part 4 Legislation and Policies 2008 Edition 1, there are specific activities that we would wish to either prevent or introduce control measures on to ensure that this potential potable source is protected.

We will object to the underground storage of hazardous substances in SPZ1. On principal and secondary aquifers outside SPZ1 we will also object unless there are genuine and overriding reasons why:

a) the activity can not take place in unproductive strata, and
b) the storage must be underground (for example public safety) in which case we expect the risk to be appropriately mitigated

P1-9- Sub water table storage (planning)
We will object to the storage of pollutants below the water table in principal and secondary aquifers.

Where such storage already exists or where the water level subsequently rises, we will work with operators to mitigate the risks, with an aim to change to above ground storage.
### Biodiversity/Ecology

We appreciate that your own ecology section will be able to advise you upon the implications of the proposed strategy and local biodiversity/ecology. However we will assess the biodiversity and ecology implications of specific developments at the application stage.

### Water Framework Directive

The Water Framework Directive (WFD) is European legislation which takes an approach to managing water called River Basin Management Planning, looking at the water within the wider ecosystem and taking into account the movement of water through the water cycle.

The WFD encourages everyone with an interest in water to work together to protect and improve the quality of every aspect of the water environment. It will help to improve and protect inland and coastal waters; drive wiser, sustainable use of water as a natural resource; and create better habitats for wildlife that live in and around water.

We draw your attention to the above European Directive and advise that any future proposals within the Pencoed regeneration scheme do not have a detrimental effect upon the rivers - Ewenny; Ewenny Fach; Nant yGeifi and other localised tributary rivers.

Mr M. Baroth

Whilst I would not propose any specific changes to the Strategy/Action Plan. I feel far greater priority should be placed on improving access across the South Wales railway line, both in the short term and medium terms.

Without improved access, particularly vehicular, the two settlements either side of the railway will remain segregated and new community/commercial developments to the east of the railway will be of limited use to residents to the west.

The comments relating to the Council’s current ‘moratorium’ on new residential development west of the railway line at Pencoed are noted.

However, the comments provide a suggestion as to how one of the projects in the Strategy could potentially be implemented.

No change / action proposed.
The need for improved access across the railway is recognized in the Adopted UDP which identifies the Penybont Road/Penprysg Road (Policy T14(3) as a major improvement to the highway network. Pending completion of the new bridge over the railway and appropriate link commencing on Hendre Road, currently no further development to the west of the railway will be permitted.

Whilst the plan seeks to fund these works by developer contributions such is the scale and expense of the works the extent of the available development opportunities supported by the UDP to the west of the railway will not fund these works.

With the significant changes to the housing market, it is unlikely sufficient land could be accommodated to the west of the railway to support the proposed highway network in the foreseeable future. Furthermore, the likelihood of Government funding for such improvements in the current or foreseeable climate is highly unlikely. In summary, whilst desirable, these improvements are a remote possibility.

Laudably, the Action Plan seeks to promote more modest improvements to the bridge and its environs to improve pedestrian safety. Whilst it’s recognized that the scheme will not increase traffic capacity it will assist the free-flow of traffic.

It is interesting to note that over 70% of respondents to the Action Plan supported both the Penprysg Road footway improvements and Penprysg/Penybont Road bridge junction improvements, with the Action Plan costs at approximately £85,000.00.

The Plan identifies the Borough Council as lead responsibility with the private sector as possible partners for funding these works. Again in the current stringent financial climate these or indeed other worthy projects identified in the...
Action Plan are unlikely to be priorities for funding in the foreseeable future.

Accordingly, I would suggest a more realistic proposal to achieve implementation of both these projects is to resurrect the principle of developer contributions promoted in Policy T14 of the Adopted UDP, bit it on a smaller scale.

Paragraph 2.3.2 of the Plan states that there are few opportunities for new housing sites in Pencoed although there is significant demand for affordable housing.

Were the Council to lift the moratorium to allow limited infill housing development which would be subject to an infrastructure payment per unit of circa £5,000.00 per unit, there would be a realistic prospect of privately funding the proposed improvement works to the existing railway bridge and adjacent area.

Providing the level of development was strictly controlled the impact on the road network would be minimal and could reasonably be considered to be outweighed by the highway safety benefits of the proposed improvements.

| Redrow Per Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners | These representations have been prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Redrow Homes in response to the Pencoed Regeneration Strategy and Action Plan that were published by Bridgend County Borough Council for consultation in October 2010. These representations have been prepared as part of the on-going promotion of land at Bocam Park, Pencoed, for mixed use (residential and commercial) development by Redrow Homes. The vision is too narrowly focussed and makes no account for growth within Pencoed which is considered a missed opportunity given its sustainable and strategic location adjacent to the M4. It is also considered that this is at odds with the housing and employment objectives stated in | The comments have been submitted in order to promote land at Bocam Park, Pencoed for mixed use development by Redrow Homes. The Regeneration Strategy for Pencoed has been prepared as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to the existing Bridgend Unitary Development Plan (UDP). It would therefore not be appropriate to seek to allocate further sites for development outside of the existing designated settlement boundary, or | No change / action proposed. |
paragraph 4.1.4 of the PRS&AP as well as the potential for growth beyond the settlement as identified within the Bridgend LDP Pre Deposit Proposals Document (Paragraph 8.4.27).

Paragraph 8.4.27 of the Bridgend LDP Pre Deposit Proposals Document states that “In Pencoed there are identified constraints, such as the railway line and flood plain, which may cause difficulties in finding new sites within the existing settlement boundary. Therefore, there may be a requirement to allocate significant Greenfield sites outside the settlement boundary in Pencoed to meet the level of growth required”.

However, although discussed very briefly within the draft PRS&AP at paragraph 1.3.12, the document fails to give any significant attention to the need to accommodate growth beyond the existing settlement boundary. We therefore consider that the vision for growth should be amended to read:

“To revitalise Pencoed, to create a place where people want to live and work, where the various public agencies, the private and voluntary sectors all work together, that has an active local community, facilities appropriate for its size of population, where opportunities for growth and economic prosperity are realised and the quality of its local environment is protected”

Whilst we have no objection to the key headings, we do not agree that the employment and housing objectives go far enough or that the strategy put forward will assist the Council in achieving these objectives.

The objective ‘Economy & Enterprise’, seeks to further develop employment opportunities within Pencoed. However, the strategy does not identify any potential employment sites or schemes which will make a significant change the existing allocations on sites as this would be contrary to the provisions of the UDP.

The strategy has also been prepared in the context of the emerging Local Development Plan which does not seek to accommodate significant levels of growth in the Pencoed area. This is the Council’s Preferred Strategy as outlined in the Pre Deposit Proposals.

The deposit LDP is expected to be published in the spring of 2010. The site being promoted here has been submitted as a Candidate Site and will be assessed accordingly. It will be for the LDP process to ascertain the appropriateness of this site (and any other in the area) for development.

On the detailed points. The Economy and Enterprise objective is appropriately worded. It is not considered necessary for new employment sites or schemes to be identified; however several of the projects in the strategy seek to improve social and physical links to existing employers.

It is agreed that the housing objective could be construed as supporting further housing growth in Pencoed. It will therefore be amended to be more realistic given the context of both the UDP and LDP.

Housing objective to be reviewed and reworded to be more realistic given the context of the UDP and LDP.
contribution to meeting this objective or indeed the vision for Pencoed. Therefore, it is considered that the strategy needs to go beyond the settlement boundary and identify sites which are available, deliverable and genuinely capable of making a significant contribution to employment to truly ensure that “economic opportunities are realised”.

Similarly, the housing objective states that the area will strive to provide a range of housing tenures to meet local need, however, no sites have been identified within the strategy which are to be developed within the short term.

Furthermore, as identified within the document, due to the constrained nature of the settlement, there are few existing opportunities for housing development. Therefore, it is unlikely that a significant amount of affordable housing can be provided within the area, and certainly not without a significant amount of private market housing provision. As such, it is considered that there is a clear need to look at opportunities to extend the existing settlement boundary in order to find sites capable of accommodating residential development in order to meet this objective.

Therefore, it is considered that the strategy needs to be extended in order to consider physical development sites for housing and employment purposes in order to ensure that the Vision and Objectives for Pencoed can be realised. Consideration must also be given to the requirement to extend the settlement boundary in order not to constrain the settlement from reaching its potential.

Overall, it is considered that the strategy fails to review the role of Pencoed and misses the wider picture as it is too narrowly focussed on small scale projects which will not address the wider social and economic issues which affect Pencoed.

The strategy also fails to identify development sites and as
such is unlikely to lead to the effective regeneration of Pencoed. Furthermore, it is considered that constraining the study area to the limits of the settlement boundary has significantly devalued the study with the potential to lead to a number of missed opportunities for the settlement and the Borough as a whole.

As it currently stands, the strategy and action plan does not provide an adequate or appropriate evidence base to inform the emerging Local Development Plan. Indeed, the strategy is largely at odds with the LDP Pre Deposit Proposals Document which states that “there may be a requirement to allocate significant Greenfield sites outside the settlement boundary in Pencoed to meet the level of growth required” (Paragraph 8.4.27).

As such, we would recommend that the study be widened to include the identification of sites with the ability to accommodate development of a scale and type capable of delivering a real step change for Pencoed and to better reflect the aspirations of the LDP. Indeed, only through major investment in employment and housing will the social and economic issues facing Pencoed be addressed and through these major investments will come the spin off benefits and funding for the smaller scale developments.

This identification of appropriate sites for major development should also include opportunities outside of the settlement boundary which could offer the potential to logically extend this sustainable and strategic settlement.

We consider that a more strategic overview should inform this regeneration strategy. This should include the consideration of new mixed use allocations and their potential to contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of Pencoed and delivery of the regeneration objectives.

Attached is a copy of a proposal for a mixed use
development at Bocam Park, this site is well located in relation to the existing urban form and provides the opportunity for the provision of necessary housing and employment land with associated community uses. The potential also exists to explore the way in which this site could contribute either directly or indirectly to the delivery of other specific regeneration schemes.