

**Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig Sir Gaerfyrddin 2018 - 2033**  
Carmarthenshire Revised Local Development Plan 2018 - 2033

**Ffurflen Sylwadau 2il Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig Adneuo**  
2nd Deposit Revised LDP Representation Form

*Hoffem gael eich barn am yr 2il Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Diwygiedig Adneuo (Cynllun Datblygu Lleol) ac ar ddogfennau sy'n cefnogi'r Cynllun Datblygu Lleol.*

*Dylid defnyddio'r ffurflen hon ar gyfer pob sylw (h.y. sylwadau neu wrthwynebiadau) Mae fersiynau nodiadau cyfarwyddyd ar gael o [www.sirgar.llyw.cymru](http://www.sirgar.llyw.cymru). Os ydych yn cyflwyno copi papur, atodwch dudalennau ychwanegol lle bod angen.*

*Bydd angen i unrhyw sylwadau a wnaed i'r CDLI Adneuo 1af gael eu hailgyflwyno fel rhan o'r ymgynghoriad ar yr 2il Adnau CDLI. Dim ond sylwadau a wnaed yn briodol i'r 2il CDLI Diwygiedig Adneuol fydd yn cael eu cyflwyno yn yr Arholiad. Ni fydd sylwadau a wnaed i'r CDLI Adneuo 1af bellach yn cael eu hystyried ac **ni fydd** yn rhan o'r Arholiad.*

*Mae gan y ffurflen hon ddwy ran: Rhan A (Manylion personol) a Rhan B (eich sylw). Sylwer y bydd Rhan B ar gael i'r cyhoedd a chaiff ei hanfon at Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio.*

***Mae'n rhaid derbyn eich sylwadau erbyn 4:30pm ar y 14 o Ebrill 2023.***

We would like your views on the Revised Carmarthenshire Local Development Plan (LDP) 2nd Deposit, and also on documents which support the LDP.

This form should be used for all representations (i.e. comments or objections). Electronic versions and guidance notes are available at [www.carmarthenshire.gov.wales](http://www.carmarthenshire.gov.wales). If you are submitting a paper copy, attach additional sheets as necessary.

Any representations made to the 1<sup>st</sup> Deposit LDP will need to be resubmitted as part of the consultation on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit LDP. Only duly made representations to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Revised LDP will be submitted for examination. Representations made to the 1<sup>st</sup> Deposit LDP will no longer be considered and will **not** form part of the Examination.

This form has two parts: Part A (Personal details) and Part B (Your representation). Please note that Part B will be made publicly available and will be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

**Your representations must be received by 4:30pm on the 14th April 2023.**

*Dychwelwch ffurflenni at:*

*Rheolwr Blaen-gynllunio, Lle a  
Chynaliadwyedd, Adran Lle a  
Seilwaith, 3 Heol Spilman,  
Caerfyrddin, SA31 1LE*

Please return forms to:

Forward Planning Manager, Place and  
Sustainability, Department of  
Sustainability and Infrastructure, 3  
Spilman Street, Carmarthen, SA31 1LE.

**RHAN A: Manylion cysylltu**

**PART A: Contact details**

***Eich manylion/manylion eich cleient***  
**Your details / your client's details**

***Manylion yr asiant***  
***(os ydynt yn***  
***berthnasol)***  
**Agent's details (if**  
**relevant)**

<i>Enw</i> Name	Mair Evans	
<i>Teitl swydd (lle y bo'n berthnasol)</i> Job title (where relevant)	Ysgrifennydd MAP	
<i>Sefydliad (lle y bo'n berthnasol)</i> Organisation (where relevant)	MAP	
<i>Cyfeiriad</i> Address	[REDACTED]	
<i>Rhif ffôn</i> Telephone no	[REDACTED]	
<i>E-bost</i> Email address	[REDACTED]	
<i>Llofnodwyd</i> Signed	[REDACTED]	
<i>Dyddiad</i> Date	13/04/23	

**RHAN B: Eich sylw**

**PART B: Your representation**

*Eich enw / sefydliad*  
Your name / organisation

MAP  
Grŵp Gweithredu Porth-y-rhyd

**1. Ar ba ran/rannau o'r Cynllun (neu ddogfennau ategol) rydych yn rhoi sylwadau?**

**1. Which part(s) of the Plan (or supporting documents) are you commenting on?**

*Rhif(au) polisi Cynllun Datblygu Lleol neu ddyraniad safle*

LDP policy or site allocation number(s)

SuV20/h1 Tir ger Llwyn Henri

Newid ffin ger Tŷ Cynheidre

*Rhif(au) paragraff y Cynllun Datblygu Lleol neu adran*

LDP paragraph or section number(s)

*Cyfeiriad(au) Map Cynigion y Cynllun Datblygu Lleol*

LDP Proposals Map reference(s)

*Os yw eich sylw yn perthyn i ddogfen ategol (e.e. y Gwerthusiad o Gynaliadwyedd), rhowch yr enw(au) a'r cyfeiriad(au) i mewn yma.*

If your representation relates to a supporting document' including the:

Sustainability Appraisal), and/or

Habitat Regulations Assessment

insert the name of the document and section reference(s) and/or paragraph number here.

**2. Cyn i chi esbonio eich sylwadau'n fanwl, byddai'n dda gwybod p'un a gredwch fod y Cynllun yn gadarn ai peidio, ac a yw'n bodloni'r gofynion gweithdrefnol.**

*I gael rhagor o wybodaeth am gadernid a gofynion gweithdrefnol, gweler y nodiadau cyfarwyddyd.*

**2. Before you set out your comments in detail, it would be helpful to know whether you think the Plan is sound and meets the procedural requirements.**

*For more information on soundness and procedural requirements, see the guidance notes.*

*Rwyf o'r farn bod y CDLI yn gadarn ac yn bodloni gofynion gweithdrefnol.*

I think the LDP is sound and meets procedural requirements.

*Rwyf o'r farn nad yw'r CDLI yn gadarn ac y dylid ei newid.*

I think the LDP is unsound and should be changed.

<p><i>Rwy'n credu na chafodd y gofynion gweithdrefnol eu bodloni.</i> I think that the procedural requirements have not been met.</p>	
<p><b>3. A hoffech i'r Cynllun gynnwys polisi, dyraniad safle neu paragraff newydd?</b> <i>Ticiwch bob un sy'n berthnasol.</i></p> <p><b>3. Would you like the LDP to include a <u>new</u> policy, site allocation or paragraph?</b> Tick <u>all</u> that apply.</p>	
<p><i>Dyraniad safle newydd</i> New site allocation</p>	
<p><i>Polisi newydd</i> New policy</p>	
<p><i>Paragraff neu destun ategol newydd</i> New paragraph or supporting text</p>	
<p><b>4. Os ydych am ychwanegu dyraniad safle newydd, a wnaethoch gyflwyno'r safle yn flaenorol fel safle cais? Os felly, a fydddech cystal â rhoi enw a chyfeiriad y safle cais (os yw'n hysbys).</b></p> <p><b>4. If you want to add a new site allocation, have you previously submitted the site as a Candidate Site? If so, please give the Candidate Site name and reference (if known).</b></p>	
<p><i>Enw'r safle</i> Site name</p>	
<p><i>Cyfeiriad y cais</i> Site reference</p>	
<p><i>Os ydych am awgrymu safle newydd, dylech atodi cynllun o'r safle yn nodi ffiniau'r safle rydych am eu cynnwys yn y Cynllun a rhoi manylion am ei ddefnydd arfaethedig. Dylech ystyried a oes angen i'r ffurflen sylwadau hon gael ei hategu gan arfarniad o gynaliadwyedd. Lle bo gan newidiadau arfaethedig i Gynllun Datblygu effeithiau cynaliadwyedd sylweddol, bydd angen i chi ddarparu'r wybodaeth berthnasol ar gyfer arfarnu cynaliadwyedd. Mae'n rhaid i'r wybodaeth hon fod yn gyson â chwmpas a lefel manylder yr arfarniad o gynaliadwyedd a gynhaliwyd gan yr Awdurdod. Dylai hefyd gyfeirio at yr un wybodaeth waelodlin wrth amlygu effeithiau sylweddol tebygol y polisi arfaethedig neu safle newydd.</i></p> <p>If you want to suggest a new site, please attach a site plan identifying the boundaries of the site you wish to be included in the Plan and provide details of its proposed use. You should consider whether it is necessary for this comments form to be accompanied by a sustainability appraisal. Where proposed changes to a</p>	

development plan have significant sustainability effects, you will need to provide the relevant sustainability appraisal information. This information must be consistent with the scope and level of detail of the sustainability appraisal conducted by the Authority. It should also refer to the same baseline information in identifying the likely significant effects of the revised policy or new site.

### **5. Rhestrwch eich sylwadau isod.**

*Dylech gynnwys yr holl wybodaeth, tystiolaeth a gwybodaeth ategol sydd eu hangen i gefnogi/cyfiawnhau eich sylw. Nodwch pa brawf/profion cadernid mae'r Cynllun Datblygu Lleol yn eu bodloni neu nad yw'n eu bodloni a pham (gweler y nodiadau cyfarwyddyd i gael rhagor o wybodaeth). Bydd hyn yn helpu'r Awdurdod a'r Arolygydd i ddeall y materion y byddwch yn eu codi. Dim ond os bydd yr Arolygydd yn eich gwahodd i fynd i'r afael â materion y bydd yn eu codi y byddwch yn gallu cyflwyno rhagor o wybodaeth i'r archwiliad. Sylwer na fydd yr Arolygydd wedi gallu gweld unrhyw sylwadau y gallech fod wedi'u gwneud mewn ymateb i ymgynghoriadau blaenorol.*

### **5. Please set out your comments below.**

Include all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify your representation. Please indicate which soundness test(s) the LDP meets or does not meet, and why (see guidance notes for more information). This will help the Authority and the Inspector to understand the issues you raise. You will only be able to submit further information to the examination if the Inspector invites you to address matters that he or she may raise. Please note that the Inspector will not have access to comments you may have made in response to previous consultations.

### **Rhagair**

- Mae MAP yn ymwybodol iawn bod angen datblygu er mwyn cadw pentrefi'n 'fyw' yn ogystal â diwallu'r angen yn lleol am gartrefi fforddiadwy a chartrefi o safon i'w rhentu.

Ond mae MAP yn pryderu hefyd am yr ardrawiadau a ddaw yn sgil rhai datblygiadau ac yn dadlau y dylai unrhyw ddatblygiad ym Mhorth-y-rhyd fod yn gydnaws â chymeriad y pentref ac wedi'i godi ar safle sy'n addas.

- Yn hytrach na thrafod cais yn ynysig mae MAP wastad yn ystyried oblygiadau'r pictiwr cyflawn yn enwedig ar adegau pan fo sawl datblygiad yn y pair yr un pryd.
- Mae MAP yn llwyr ymwybodol o'r dasg heriol sydd gan swyddogion Blaen-gynllunio i'w wneud i glustnodi safleoedd ar gyfer cyrraedd targedau.
- Sylweddolwn bod briff wedi'i roi i Adrannau Blaen-gynllunio ddosbarthu cwota i bob pentref ac nid oes gennym wrthwynebiad i'r argymhelliad hwn o gwbl. Mae'n ddisgwyliad hollol resymegol

a theg fyddai'n arwain at ddsbarthu tai dros ardal eang yn hytrach na rhoi sêl bendith i ddatblygiad mawr fyddai fel ploryn mewn pentref. Popeth yn dda os oes tir addas i'w ddatblygu ar gael. Yn anffodus, mae pentref Porth-y-rhyd yn wahanol i'r rhelyw o bentrefi eraill yn y fro. Mae'n bentref ar lawr dyffryn, y rhan helaethaf ohono o fewn Parthau Llifogydd B ac C2 a phrif bibell yn tramwyo trwyddo. Am y rhesymau uchod a'r ffaith na chaniateir datblygiadau o fewn pellter penodol i'r bibell, tasg heriol yw clustnodi safle addas ym mhentref Porth-y-rhyd.

Dyma'r argymhellion ar gyfer Porth-y-rhyd :

1. Newid y ffin o flaen Tŷ Cynheidre i ddarparu safle ar gyfer ei ddatblygu.

2. Safle SuV20/h1            Tir sy'n ffinio â Fferm Llwyn Henri

3. Wernfraith                Mae'r safle wedi'i ddad-ddyrannu o'r CDLI Diwygiedig 2018 - 2033 ond yn dal yn safle wedi'i ddyrannu yn y cynllun mabwysiedig CDLI 2018 sy'n dal mewn grym nes y'i disodlir gan y fersiwn hwn.

Mae'n debygol iawn y bydd cais yn cael ei gyflwyno ar gyfer 42 o dai. Os caiff ei ddatblygu yna bydd yn cael ei gategoreiddio fel Hap-safle.

Teimlir mai dyma'r amser gorau i dynnu sylw at faterion o bwys a phryder i drigolion Porth-y-rhyd. Mae'r adroddiad yn crynhoi'r holl ddadleuon, sylwadau a barn a leisiwyd ganddynt.

Gwerthfawrogir y cyfle i fod yn rhan o'r broses ymgynghori y tro hwn eto.

## **SYLWADAU'R TRIGOLION**

### **1. NEWID FFIN Y PENTREF**

Sylwyd bod newid ffin i gynnwys tir o flaen Tŷ Cynheidre yn cael ei argymhell yn y fersiwn diwygiedig hwn.

Rydym ar ddeall nad oes manylion am yr hyn a fwriedir parthed datblygu'r cae ar yr adeg hon yn y broses. Nid oes manylion am y math o ddatblygiad, y nifer o dai na'r math o dai fyddai'n cael eu hadeiladu ar y tir. Efallai mai adeilad arall a fwriedir? Adeilad amaethyddol?

Tynnwyd sylw at y bibell sy'n croesi'r cae. Mae'r bibell yn fwy o faint na'r arferol felly holwyd a oes angen clustogfa o unrhyw fath i ddiogelu'r bibell? Os felly, beth yw mesuriadau'r glustogfa?

A yw'r ffaith bod pibell ddŵr yn croesi'r cae yn mynd i gael unrhyw effaith ar Hyfywedd ac Ymarferoldeb y safle?

**Gan nad oes rhagor o wybodaeth ar gael ar hyn o bryd mae'n anodd ymateb yn deg i'r newid hwn. Yr unig opsiwn sydd gan MAP felly ar yr adeg hon yn y broses Ymgynghoriad yw GWRTHWYNEBU.**

**2. Safle SuV20/h1** Rhan o SR/139/002 a **CA0894** \* Heb ddod ar draws y cyfeirnod hwn o'r blaen.

Nodir yn y ddogfen drafft nad oes Hanes Cynllunio Perthnasol i'r safle arfaethedig hwn ond credwn ei bod yn holl bwysig edrych yn ôl ar hanes y safle hwn.

**2012 -**

Cynigiwyd y cae hwn a adwaenwyd fel ALT/159/006/N yn un o saith safle amgen ar gyfer CDLI 2006 - 2018. Roedd y safle yn 0.75 hectar gyda photensial i ddarparu 15 o dai.

Dyma ddyfarniad Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio Annibynnol bryd hynny:

*In summary the site is linked but does not completely adjoin an existing cluster of development to the north of the core of the settlement. However, its development would represent the extension of this cluster further into the undeveloped adjoining open countryside. With no key services located at the cluster in question, this is not considered to be the most sustainable location for further development nor would it be in character with the general existing pattern of development of the village. In addition, the level of flood risk (which could be greater than perceived by the DAM) also seriously questions its deliverability.*

Gw: Adroddiad am y Safleoedd Amgen yn Llanddarog a Phorth-y-rhyd. Mai 2012.(JCR)

*Alternative Site Review Report for Llanddarog and Porth-y-rhyd May 2012.(JCR)*

Cyflwynodd MAP ddadleuon ar nifer o'r pwyntiau cynllunio: dwysedd, newid cymeriad y pentref, ardrawiad negyddol ar dai a thrigolion cyfagos, problemau mynedfa a diogelwch, straen ar y gwasanaethau, cynnydd mewn cymudo, colli tir amaethyddol, colli cae draeniad naturiol a allai arwain at broblemau dwys dŵr glaw. Prif bryder MAP oedd y parthau llifogydd C2 a B a'r ffaith bod y brif beipen yn 'anghyfforddus o agos' at y safle.

Mae MAP yn dal i aros am ateb i gwestiwn a holwyd bryd hynny:

*Faint o le sydd angen ei gadw'n glir i greu clustogfa ar gyfer gwarchod y bibell?*

Cyflwynwyd tystiolaeth amrywiol yn cynnwys Deiseb a arwyddwyd gan dros 300 o bobl.

Cynhaliwyd Profion Methodoleg Asesu'r Safle, Asesiad Cynaliadwyedd, Asesiad Amgylcheddol Strategol a rhestrwyd nifer o resymau Cynllunio cadarn dros wrthod y safle a pheidio â'i gynnwys o fewn y Ffin Datblygu. Yn dilyn Gwrandawriad (HS19) gydag Arolygydd Annibynnol gwrthodwyd y safle:-

*The site has been through the Site Assessment Methodology and the consideration of the site has been included within the Assessment of Site paper. It is considered that the site failed Phase 2b of that methodology for the following reasons:*

- Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the settlement or its features (including views and glimpses both into and out of the settlement.)*
- In order for this development to take place, it would mean a considerable amount of new vehicular traffic on the minor road which leads to the site. Similar the Council's response during the UDP examination the carriageway would need to be widened to facilitate the development of the land for housing. As a result the land is both unnecessary and unsuitable for allocation.*

Yn 2012 roedd y Cae Uchaf yn cael ei gynnig fel safle amgen ar wahân ALT/159/007/N.

Safle 1.2 hectar oedd hwn gyda photensial i ddarparu 24 o dai.



Gwrthodwyd y cae hwn hefyd oherwydd problemau parthed y mynediad ac fel y dywedodd yr Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio:

*'In summary, its development would extend the aforesaid cluster in a manner that would alter the current pattern of development and be of a scale that would represent an unsympathetic encroachment into the open countryside. In addition, clear access constraints question its deliverability.'*

Argymhellodd yr Adran Blaen-gynllunio wrthod y safle ar sail nifer o ddadleuon cynllunio a dyna oedd dyfarniad yr Arolygydd Annibynnol yn y Gwrandawriad. (Ebrill 2014)

**Yn ddiweddarach, cadarnhaodd y Cyngor iddynt wrthod cynnwys y safle yn y CDLI 'yn seiliedig ar broses cadarn a rhesymegol'.**

**2018 - SR/159/002**

Yn 2018 cyfunwyd y cae gwaelod (ALT 159/006/N sef SuV20/h1) a'r cae uchaf (ALT/159/007/N) i greu un safle – y cae gwaelod yn 0.7 h. a'r cae uchaf yn 1.1h. Roedd y cynllun ar gyfer 32 o dai. Argymhellwyd creu mynedfa newydd ar waelod yr hen heol - ymgais i ddatrys y problemau dwys mynediad a fu'n rhannol gyfrifol am iddo gael ei wrthod yn 2014. Golygai fwy na dyblu niferoedd y tai.

*Gweler:* Adroddiad i Gefnogi'r Safle Dyddiedig Gorffennaf 2018 (JCR)

Bu gwrthwynebiad chwyrn i'r cynllun a rhyddhad pan gafodd ei wrthod.

**2020**

Yn 2020 penderfynodd yr Adran Blaen-gynllunio ar y canlynol:

- Gwrthod cynnwys y cae uchaf i'r gogledd-ddwyrain fel rhan o'r safle.
- Hepgor ardal de-orllewinol y cae gwaelod sy'n ffinio â'r B4310.
- Argymell codi 6 o dai yn unig ar y cae.

*\* Ni fydd y nifer tai yn bendant nes y cyflwynir cais cynllunio manwl.*

Roedd hepgor y cae uchaf yn gyfangwbl a'r ffaith na fyddai adeiladu ar dir o fewn y parthau llifogydd yn newyddion i'w groesawu. Rhaid

cydnabod hefyd bod 6 o dai yn fwy synhwyrol fel datblygiad i bentref o faint Porth-y-rhyd.

Rhaid pwysleisio NAD yw MAP yn gwrthwynebu datblygu ond mae'n gwrthwynebu adeiladu ar safleoedd anaddas all arwain at ardrawiadau negyddol yn enwedig o ran problemau dŵr glaw a'r system garthffosiaeth.

Er yr addasiadau teimlai'r trigolion bod raid gwrthwynebu y tro hwn eto **oblegid mai dyma'r union gae a ddyfarnwyd yn safle anaddas ar gyfer ei ddatblygu yn 2014 a bod y rhesymau dilys dros ei wrthod bryd hynny yn dal dŵr o hyd!**

### **2023 - SuV20/h1**

Ar hyn o bryd nid oes manylion pellach ar gael parthed cynllun y safle, y fynedfa arfaethedig, y math o gartrefi y bwriedir eu darparu nac ychwaith y nifer o dai. Yr unig beth a wneir yw cadarnhau bod lle i godi 5+ o dai. Gall hynny olygu 6? / 10? / 14?

Ymddengys bod yr Ymgeisydd wedi cyflwyno tystiolaeth parthed Hyfywedd ac Ymarferoldeb y safle (*Gw. Pwynt 28 Hyfywedd ac Ymarferoldeb*) ond nad yw'r wybodaeth honno ar gael i'r cyhoedd.

**Mae teimlad cryf yn y pentref mai dyma'r union gae a wrthodwyd am resymau cynllunio cadarn yn y gorffennol. Mynegwyd pryder hefyd am yr amwysedd a'r ansicrwydd parthed nifer tai.**

Cytunwyd felly i gyflwyno dadleuon a thystiolaeth cyn y dyddiad cau gan hyderu y cawn gyfle eto i ymateb yn llawnach i'r cynllun unwaith y bydd gwybodaeth bellach parthed SuV20/h1 ar gael i'r cyhoedd.

Cytunwyd bod MAP yn datgan GWRTHWYNEBIAD i gynnwys safle SuV20/h1 yn y CDLI Diwygiedig 2018 – 2033 ar sail y dadleuon canlynol..

### **1. Tresmasu i dir agored**

Byddai datblygiad ar y safle hwn yn tresmasu i dir agored. Dyna un o'r rhesymau pam y'i gwrthodwyd yn 2014. Ni fyddai'n estyniad naturiol.

*'Its development would represent the extension of this cluster further into the undeveloped adjoining open countryside'.*

*Dyfyniad o adroddiad Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio yn 2014*

## **2. Colli tir amaethyddol**

Yn yr adran sy'n ystyried Ystyriaethau Amgylcheddol noda bwynt rhif 21 nad yw'r safle'n cynnwys tir amaethyddol o ansawdd uchel (gradd 1,2,3a) ond prydera'r trigolion lleol am ddiflaniad cae arall ellid ei ddefnyddio i'r dyfodol fel cae amaethyddol. Mae cymaint o sôn yn dilyn **Brexit** am bwysigrwydd ffermio a chynhyrchu bwyd yn lleol.

Onid oes angen dwys ystyried pa ddewis sydd orau. Ai defnyddio'r cae ar gyfer adeiladu tai arno a choncritio tir draeniad pwysig neu'i ddiogelu ar gyfer ei amaethu am flynyddoedd i ddod a dal gafael mewn cae pwysig o ran ei rôl yn draenio dŵr glaw?

## **3. Colli ardal werdd**

Mae cymaint o sôn am bwysigrwydd yr amgylchedd ac ardaloedd gwyrdd o ran lles ac iechyd trigolion ac mae Deddf Llesiant Cenedlaethau'r Dyfodol (Cymru) 2015 yn hyrwyddo gwarchod ein hamgylchedd hardd er lles trigolion.

Mae Cwm Gwendraeth yn hen ardal ddiwydiannol ac mae digon o safleoedd brown o fewn tafliad carreg i'r safle hwn. Pam na ellir datblygu'r rheiny cyn troi golygon at dir gwyrdd?

Beth am yr holl siopau ac adeiladau gwag yn ein trefi – Rhydaman, Llanelli a Chaerfyrddin?

Does bosib bod digon o safleoedd addas wedi'u dotio led led y Sir – safleoedd y gellid eu datblygu'n ddiraffferth a di-wrthwynebiad er mwyn darparu cartrefi yn gyflym i gwrdd â'r galw yn lleol.

Arwyddodd drigolion y pentref Ddeiseb yng Ngwanwyn 2019 yn gofyn yn garedig am i chwi wneud hynny.

## **4. Ardrowiad andwyol ar gartrefi sy'n ffinio**

Dau fyngalo yn unig sydd yn ffinio â'r cae hwn. Mae'r tai eraill cyfagos yn dilyn patrwm llinellol o boptu'r hen heol. Nid colli golygfa, preifatrwydd

neu olau yn unig all ddigwydd i drigolion y byngalos ond gall eu tai – eu heiddo a'u buddsoddiad - ddibrisio dros nos unwaith yr adeiledir tai yn union o'u blaenau.

Mae Polisi GP1 y CDLI yn pwysleisio pwysigrwydd ystyried a yw datblygiad yn gweddu i'r hyn sydd o'i gwmpas 'o ran graddfa ac uchder .... ac na ddylai gael effaith andwyol o ran ardrawiad gweledol, golau, preifatrwydd.'

*'the importance that developments are compatible with their surroundings in terms of scale, height, massing, and general topography of locality.... must not adversely affect local amenity in terms of*

*visual impact, loss of light and privacy, disturbance and traffic movement....'*

Mae'r safle hwn ar lechwedd gyda lefel y tir yn codi'n sylweddol o'r ffordd (B4310) islaw.

Oni fydd hyn yn achosi problemau? Tybed pa fath o dai a ganiateir ? Ai byngalos neu dai?

A fydd toi y tai newydd yn tyrru uwchben y cartrefi cyfagos?

Sylwer ar sylwadau'r Adran Gynllunio pan wrthodwyd y safle yn 2014.

- *Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the settlement or its features (including views and glimpses both into and out of the settlement.)*

Beth sydd wedi newid?

## **5. Colli tir draeniad pwysig**

Ni colli tir glas yn unig fyddai canlyniad datblygu'r cae hwn. Byddai concritio'r cae yn golygu colli cae draeniad naturiol pwysig arall a fyddai yn ei dro yn arwain at ddwysáu'r problemau dŵr glaw sy'n bodoli'n barod yn y rhan hon o'r pentref.

Ar hyn o bryd mae'r holl ddŵr glaw yn llifo o'r llethrau cyfagos i ddraenio yn y cae hwn.

Yn aml gwelir pyllau ar y cae a phan fydd yn ddyfrlawn llifa'r dŵr ar draws y B4310.

Hoffai MAP dynnu sylw at y ffaith nad argymell peidio ag adeiladu ar Barthau Llifogydd yn unig a wneir erbyn hyn ond i beidio ag adeiladu ar dir sy'n ffinio â Pharthau Llifogydd hefyd.

Mae'r neges yn glir. Dyma'r caeau pwysig o ran draeniad.

## **6. Parthau Llifogydd**

Yn y Gwrandawriad (HS19) Ebrill 2014 gofynnodd yr Arolygydd Annibynnol i'r Awdurdod Cynllunio Lleol gadarnhau a oedd y cae hwn o fewn Parth Llifogydd B ac C2 fel yr honnai MAP ai peidio.

*LPA to confirm whether alternative site ALT/159/006/N 'Land east of Llwyn Henry Farm' is within a TAN 15 DAM Flood Zone.*

*The map in Appendix 3 indicates the TAN 15 DAM Flood Zone maps for ALT/159/006/N*

*The southern and western sections of the site lie within Zone B, with a part of the site within Zone C2'*

Does dim wedi newid. Mae rhan isaf y cae yn dal o fewn Parthu Llifogydd C2 a B.

## **7. Y Bibell Ddŵr**

Gofid arall i'r trigolion yw bod y safle arfaethedig hwn yn 'anghyfforddus o agos' at y bibell sy'n cludo dŵr o Orsaf Bwmpio Nantgaredig i Felindre.

Cytunai'r Ymgynghorydd Cynllunio yn 2014 : *'the pipeline skirts the site'*.

Rhaid cadw llain o dir yn glir o boptu'r bibell i greu clustogfa neu Goridor Diogelwch.

A oes unrhyw ran o safle SuV20/h1 yn tarfu ar y Coridor Diogelwch hwn?

## **8. Mynedfa:**

Ceisiwyd datrys problemau'r fynedfa i'r safle drwy argymhell creu agoriad newydd yn agos at y gyffordd ar waelod y lôn. Byddai hyn yn arbed i yrwyr y safle ddefnyddio'r lôn gul, un trac, 10 -12 troedfedd o led mewn manau.

Nid yw'r lleoliad hwn yn addas o gwbl ar gyfer mynedfa. Mae'r B4310 yn ffordd brysur yn enwedig yn ystod yr oriau brig ac nid yw'r gwelediad i'r ddau gyfeiriad yn dda o gwbl. Ffordd gul droellog yw'r B4310 o Glenfryn draw at sgwar y pentref. Oherwydd nad oes gan y teras o dai ar y chwith garej na lle i barcio'r ceir does dim dewis ganddynt ond parcio ar y ffordd.

Rhaid ystyried hefyd yr holl drafnidiaeth ychwanegol fydd yn teithio heibio'r safle arfaethedig hwn pan fydd SWTRA yn cau cyffordd Foelgastell i'r ddau gyfeiriad a chyffordd Llanddarog i gyfeiriad Crosshands. Golyga hyn y bydd holl gymudwyr pentrefi Llanddarog, Llangyndeyrn, Cwm Mawr, Mynydd Cerrig, Foelgastell a Drefach yn defnyddio'r B4310 heibio'r safle hwn ddwywaith y dydd.

Dyma ddyfyniad o lythyr SWTRA :

*'the closure of, or modifications to existing junctions will clearly result in traffic having to divert along minor roads and the implications of this needs to be fully taken into account.'*

Bob tro y mae digwyddiad ar y ffordd ddeuol A40 rhwng Crosshands a Chaerfyrddin dargyfeirir y cerbydau drwy bentref Porth-y-rhyd. Digwydd hyn yn bur gyson.

Teimla'r trigolion nad yw'r ffaith bod modd cael mynedfa arall i'r cae yn datrys yr holl broblemau dwys eraill.

## **9. Problemau lifogydd a dŵr glaw.**

Un o brif ofidiau'r trigolion yw'r problemau dŵr glaw a ddaw yn sgil datblygu safleoedd anaddas.

Mae hanesion am lifogydd yn y pentref yn dyddio'n ôl flynyddoedd lawer. Adroddodd un o'r trigolion, a oedd yn ei nawdegau ar y pryd, ei hatgofion am lifogydd pan oedd hi'n blentyn. Disgrifiodd yr holl ddŵr yn llifo fel afon o'r llethrau ac i mewn i'r tai.

Yn fuan wedi i'r gwaith ar ddatblygiad Clôs y Wennol ddechrau ffurfiodd llyn mawr o amgylch dau o fyngalos tai'r henoed – Cwm Cati – wedi glaw trwm. Wrth bwmpio'r dŵr dywedodd swyddog y Frigad Dân ei bod yn 'gwbl amlwg nad oes unman i'r dŵr fynd iddo.' Nid dyna'r unig dro. Galwodd yr henoed sawl gwaith dros y blynyddoedd am gymorth cymdogion i fopio, glanhau a diogelu eu heiddo.

Bob tro yn dilyn glaw trwm gwelir 'llynnoedd' yn ymddangos ar gaeau yn y pentref – y cae hwn a chae Wernfraith.

Adeiladwyd ar Barth Llifogydd ac ar gae draeniad allweddol bwysig yng nghanol y pentref. Concritiwyd y cae hwn oedd arfer delio â'r holl ddŵr a lifai o'r llechweddau gan ei atal rhag achosi problemau ar y sgwar ac i dai cyfagos dros y ffordd.

Rhyddhad yn wir oedd gweld bod yr Adran Blaen- gynllunio wedi gwrthod safle amgen arall yng nghanol y pentref yn 2019 – safle sydd ar barth llifogydd ac a fyddai wedi creu problemau dwys i'r cartrefi cyfagos.

Edrychwch ar y lluniau o'r llifogydd yn 2009 a'r casgliad o ffotograffau sydd yn yr atodiad.

Mae problemau dŵr glaw yn ardal y safle hwn ger Llwyn Henri. Llifa'r holl ddŵr glaw o'r bryn ac o ddatblygiad yr hen heol fach i'r cae gwaelod hwn sydd â rhan ohono o fewn parth llifogydd C2 a B. Mae'r cae yn aml yn ddyfrlawn a phwll yn ffurfio ar y gwaelod bob tro y cawn law trwm.

Gweler y ffotograff a dynnwyd ar Ebrill 11eg 2023 wedi pedair awr o law trwm.

Mae angen dwys ystyried i ble fydd yr holl ddŵr glaw yn llifo pe concritir y cae hwn?

Ychydig draw o'r safle hwn mae ardal arall gyda phroblemau dŵr glaw oherwydd i'r ceuffosydd a'r gwteri gael eu blocio pan godwyd y tai newydd.

Blerwch, diffyg cynllunio a diffyg monitro achosodd yr hunllef hwn i'r trigolion sy'n byw ger y datblygiad anorffenedig.

Mae gennym ffeil o ohebiaeth sy'n croniclo dros 20 mlynedd o ddiflastod trigolion.

Yng ngeiriau un o'r trigolion yn ddiweddar "*er bod datblygwr yn honni y gall ddatrys problem dŵr glaw ar y safle nid dyna'r realiti a gadewir trigolion i ddelio â chanlyniadau ardrawiad negyddol y datblygiad ar eu liwt eu hunain!*"

## 10. Y system garthffosiaeth

Bu cryn gyhoeddusrwydd yn ddiweddar am ollwng carthion heb eu trin i'r afonydd. Achosir y broblem oherwydd bod system dŵr glaw a'r system garthffosiaeth yn un system gyfunol.

Yn ôl ystadegau 2021 Dŵr Cymru digwyddodd hyn 77 gwaith yn yr Orsaf Bwmpio ym Mhontfaen. Nid yw'r ffigwr hwn yn cynnwys yr holl adegau y llifodd carthion yn 'ddamweiniol' ar gaeau a gerddi.

- Mae Pwmp Pontfaen sy'n pwmpio'r gwastraff i Orsaf Cwmisfael wedi dyddio ac er iddo gael ei uwchraddio flynyddoedd yn ôl nid yw'n ymdopi'n effeithiol. Nid yw hynny'n syndod gan na fwriadwyd i'r pwmp hwn ddelio â gwastraff cymaint yn fwy o dai yn ogystal â'r dŵr glaw ychwanegol sy'n llifo o gaeau a goncritiwyd.
- Adeiladwyd dros 40 o dai yn y pentref ers c 2000 - **cynnydd o 43%.**
- Adeiladwyd yr holl gartrefi ychwanegol ond ni fu unrhyw waith uwchraddio ar y system.
- Sut mae disgwyl i'r system ymdopi os bydd mwy o ddatblygu eto yn y pentref ac yn Llanddarog gan mai'r UN system sy'n gwasanaethu'r ddau bentref.
- Gwerthfawrogwn bod yr Adran Gynllunio yn ystyried pob cais yn unigol gan wneud hynny'n gwbl deg a phroffesiynol ond mae'n hanfodol edrych ar y **pictiwr llawn.**
- Ar hyn o bryd mae cynllun i godi 42 o dai ar safle Wernfraith. Does dim amheuaeth y byddai caniatáu'r datblygiad hwn yn achosi ardrawiad trychinebus o ran y system garthffosiaeth a dŵr glaw yn y pentref.
- Clwstwr bach o dai a argymhellir ar y safle hwn a ger Tŷ Cynheidre (o bosib) OND mae'n bwysig rhifo'r tai i gyd i sylweddoli faint o straen ychwanegol fydd ar y system.



Porth-y-rhyd	Wernfraith	42	
	SuV20/h1	6	6? 10? 14?
	Cynheidre	5 ?	
Llanddarog	SuV19/h1	16	(0.903 hectar)
	SuV19/h2	15	( 0.863 hectar)
Hap safleoedd eraill -		Amhosib dyfalu nifer!	

**Mae'r cyfanswm isaf posib yn 84 o dai ond gallai fod yn llawer uwch.**

Dychmygwch y **straen anferthol ar system ddiffygiol** gyda'r holl dai ychwanegol.

Rhaid cofio bod Porth-y-rhyd wedi bod dan fygythiad yn 1963 pan oedd Corfforaeth Ddŵr Abertawe am foddi'r pentref. A oes perygl iddo gael ei foddi yn 2023!

Cysylltodd MAP â Dŵr Cymru a chadarnhawyd ganddynt bod angen uwchraddio systemau pentrefi cefn gwlad Cymru ac NA fydd cyllid i gyflawni'r gwaith yn y dyfodol agos o gwbl.

**Beth fydd y sefyllfa yn y cyfamser ?**

Gwaethygu fydd y tywydd i'r dyfodol a byddwn ni, a'r cenedlaethau fydd yn ein dilyn yn gorfod delio gyda'r canlyniadau.

Bydd yn rhy hwyr i wyrddroi'r sefyllfa unwaith y bydd cae wedi diflannu dan goncrid.

Mae'r argymhellion gan yr arbenigwyr yn nodi'n glir ei bod yn annoeth adeiladu ar gaeau nesaf at barth llifogydd gan mai'r rhain yw'r caeau draenio holl bwysig.

Mae'r neges yn glir yn llythyr Julie James AS Y Gweinidog Newid Hinsawdd (Tachwedd 23ain 2021).

*Given the immediate and serious challenges posed by the climate emergency, a 'business as usual' approach ... is no longer a viable option. Taking meaningful action to address climate change will mean taking difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions. The planning system is at the forefront of responding to the climate emergency and ensuring the well-being of current and future generations.*

*The decisions local planning authorities make today will have a profound effect on how we adapt to climate change now and in the future. It is particularly important that we protect homes from flooding, when we know the devastating impact it can have on health and well-being.*

Gwerthfawrogwn barodrwydd yr Ymgeisydd i addasu'r safle sawl gwaith.

Gwerthfawrogwn benderfyniadau'r Adran Blaen-gynllunio a'u hargymhellion diweddaraf.

### **OND**

- er bod y cae uchaf wedi'i hepgor,
- er bod y safle wedi'i docio fel nad yw o fewn Parth Llifogydd
- ac er bod y nifer tai a argymhellir bellach yn fwy rhesymol (5+ ?)

mae'r pryder parthed problemau dŵr glaw a'r system garthffosiaeth yn **gorbwyso** hyn oll.

### **3. WERNFRAITH**

Mae MAP wedi astudio'n fanwl gynlluniau'r datblygwyr POBOL Group a JONES (Henllan).

#### **Bydd yr ardrawiad yn hunllefus.**

Bwriedir **GWRTHWYNEBU** unwaith y cyflwyna'r datblygwyr gais cynllunio.

Yn y cyfamser ymatebodd trigolion y pentref i'r Ymgynghoriad Cyn Ymgeisio a drefnwyd gan yr Asiant Evans Banks. Cyflwynwyd 165 llythyr yn datgan **GWRTHWYNEBIAD** a nifer fawr o ebyst.

**Bwriedir brwydro yn erbyn y datblygiad arfaethedig hwn.**

- MAP is fully aware of the need for development to keep villages 'alive and viable' and create affordable homes and decent rental accomodation for local people. However, MAP is also committed to consider the impact of any proposed developments in Porth-y-rhyd and to ensure that any kind of development is in character with the village and is built on a site where there are no issues.
- Although MAP debates applications individually when they are submitted, it also looks at the broader picture and tries to determine the true impact all developments combined (if granted permission) would have on the village.
- MAP appreciates the challenge facing Forward Planning Officers to identify suitable sites for developments in order to reach targets set.
- MAP realises that Forward Planning has been given a brief to ensure that all villages are allocated a quota - a reasonable argument to be commended as it would avoid the danger of a massive 'carbuncle' of a development being forced on one village. In theory this is all well and good provided that there are suitable sites available. That unfortunately is not the case in Porth-y-rhyd – a village on the valley floor, within designated Flood Zones and with a pipeline traversing across it. It is, therefore, a far more challenging task.

These are the recommendations for Porth-y-rhyd:

- Change of boundary to include land near Tŷ Cynheidre for development.
- Site SuV20/h1 Land adjacent to Llwyn Henri
- Wernfraith Although this site has been de-allocated in the Revised LDP 2018 – 2033

it remains an allocated site in the current LDP 2006-2018. Our understanding is that when the Revised LDP will come into force Wernfraith will be classified as a Windfall Site.

Residents are of the opinion that this is the time to draw the attention of the Planning Authority to important issues and concerns. It was decided to compile a report on their behalf summarizing all concerns, comments and opinions expressed by the deadline of April 14<sup>th</sup> and hopefully have the opportunity to respond to specific details relating to

SuV20/h1 and the change of boundary once information is available to the public.

MAP appreciates the opportunity to participate in this Consultation.

### **1. CHANGE OF BOUNDARY**

It appears that a change of boundary is recommended to include a field below Tŷ Cynheidre.

We understand that no information is available at this stage in the process as to the kind of development intended, the number of dwellings or the type of homes. It is therefore difficult to respond to this change in boundary without having all the relevant details. Perhaps a different type of building will be proposed – a farm building?

MAP's attention was drawn to the fact that another pipeline crosses this field.

This pipeline is wider than the usual water supply pipes. Is there a need to ensure a buffer zone on either side of the pipeline? If so, what measurements would that entail?

Will the fact that a pipeline crosses this field affect the Viability and Deliverability?

As there is no information available at this stage in the process to enable MAP to respond in a fair and professional way there is only one option open to us which is to **OPPOSE**.

### **2. Candidate Site SuV20/h1 Part of SR/139/002**

**CA0894\***Have not seen this reference before.

It is stated in the draft that there is no Relevant Planning History to this proposed site but the residents believe it is vitally important to look back on the planning history of this site.

#### **2012**

This field referred to as **ALT/159/006/N** was submitted at the Deposit LDP stage as one of seven alternative sites to be included in the Local Development Plan 2006 - 2018 (adopted in 2014). The site was 0.75 hectares with a proposed potential capacity for 15 units.

This was the conclusion reached at that time by an independent Planning Consultant:

*In summary the site is linked but does not completely adjoin an existing cluster of development to the north of the core of the settlement. However, its development would represent the extension of this cluster further into the undeveloped adjoining open countryside. With no key services located at the cluster in question, this is not considered to be the most sustainable location for further development nor would it be in character with the general existing pattern of development of the village. In addition, the level of flood risk (which could be greater than perceived by the DAM) also seriously questions its deliverability.*

See: Alternative Site Review Report for Llanddarog and Porth-y-rhyd May 2012.

The action group MAP acted on behalf of the residents presenting evidence on planning issues such as density, the change in character of the village, negative impact on neighbouring properties, problems with the then proposed entrance and increase in vehicles using the narrow winding old lane, strain on services, school had reached it's capacity, increase in commuting, loss of agricultural land, and loss of drainage field that would lead to more problems relating to surface water.

MAP's main concern was the fact that areas of the field were within flood zones B and C2 and that the main pipeline from Nantgaredig to Felindre skirted the site.

MAP still awaits an answer to a question asked in 2012:

*What area needs to be kept clear of developments in order to create a buffer zone or corridor of protection?*

Evidence was presented at the time including a Petition signed by over 300 residents (95% of the residents).

Site Assessment Methodology, Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment etc were carried out and following a robust and rational site selection process the boundary was drawn to exclude the site. At the Hearing it was confirmed by the LPA that alternative site ALT 159/006/N 'Land east of Llwyn Henry' is within a TAN 15 DAM Flood Zone as argued by MAP. Following the Hearing chaired by an Independent Planning Inspector the site was turned down.

*The site has been through the Site Assessment Methodology and the consideration of the site has been included within the Assessment of Site paper. It is considered that the site failed Phase 2b of that methodology for the following reasons:*

- Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the settlement or its features (including views and glimpses both into and out of the settlement.)*
- In order for this development to take place, it would mean a considerable amount of new vehicular traffic on the minor road which leads to the site. Similar the Council's response during the UDP examination the carriageway would need to be widened to facilitate the development of the land for housing. As a result the land is both unnecessary and unsuitable for allocation.*

The upper field was also submitted for consideration as an alternative site in 2012 - ALT/159/007/N. The site size of 1.2 hectares had a potential capacity for 24+ units.

The Independent Planning Consultant stated: *'In summary, its development would extend the aforesaid cluster in a manner that would alter the current pattern of development and be of a scale that would represent an unsympathetic encroachment into the open countryside. In addition, clear access constraints question its deliverability.'*

Forward Planning Dept. proposed the site be refused based on numerous planning issues and that was also the decision of the Independent planning Inspector at the Hearing. (April 2014)

The Council confirmed that the site had been refused based on a robust and rational process.

### **2018 – SR/159/002**

A new proposal was submitted in 2018 – 2019 . The lower field (ALT/159/006/N now SuV20/h1 ) was combined with the upper field (ALT/159/007/N) to create one large site – the lower field of 0.7 hectares and the larger upper field of 1.1 h. The proposal was for 32 houses. Access would now be at the bottom of the lane, thus avoiding the use of existing narrow lane. It also meant that the number of dwellings would more than double.

*See: Candidate Site Supporting Statement dated July 2018 (JCR)*

There was overwhelming opposition to this proposal and relief when it was REFUSED.

## **2020**

- The north-eastern upper field enclosure is no longer included. in the Revised Local Development Plan 2028 - 2033
- A portion of the lower south - western field that extends along the B4310 has also been excluded. Only part of the lower field is allocated for housing.
- Forward-Planning Dept. has identified 6 dwellings as being indicative for the site.

*(Exact housing figures for the site will be determined when a detailed planning application is submitted).*

The fact that the upper field has been excluded is welcomed as is the fact that there will be no building on the flood zone areas. A development of six dwellings also seems far more reasonable in a village the size of Porth-y-rhyd. We must stress that MAP is **not** opposed to developments but is concerned when developments are proposed on unsuitable sites where the impact will have a detrimental effect especially regarding surface water and sewerage problems.

However, as this is the exact same field that was categorically refused in 2014 following a Public Hearing and regarded as an unsuitable site for development, MAP objected.

## **2023 - SuV20/h1**

It is impossible for MAP to respond as we would have wished to SuV20/h1 as no detailed information is available to date regarding the plan of the site, the proposed entrance, the type of houses or the exact number of dwellings. It is confirmed that the site can accommodate 5 or more dwellings. What exactly does this mean? 6 / 10 / or more?

The Applicant has provided '*sufficient evidence to show that the development is deliverable and financially viable*' (See Point 28. Viability

and Deliverability) and that was all the requirement at the current stage in the process. This document is not in the public domain.

It was agreed that MAP would compile a report summarizing the arguments and evidence of the residents and respond again to the detailed information available once that is in the public domain. .

### **1. Encroaching onto open land.**

This proposed development would be encroaching onto open land. It is not a 'natural extension'.

That was one of the main arguments in 2014 that led to it's refusal.

*'Its development would represent the extension of this cluster further into the undeveloped adjoining open countryside'.*

*Report of the Planning Consultant in 2014 (JCR)*

### **2. Loss of agricultural land**

In the section dealing with Environmental Consideration it is stated in Point 20 that the site does not contain high quality agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 or 3a.) but the local residents fear that yet another agricultural field will disappear under concrete – a field that would be of agricultural value to future generations. There has been so much discussion since Brexit of the importance of farming and producing food locally. Should we not pause to consider which is the best option? To build on this field and lose a drainage field in the process or to preserve it for agricultural use for years to come and retain an important natural surface water drainage field?

### **3. Green areas**

There is so much talk today about the importance of green areas to support people's physical and mental well-being. [Well-being of Future Generations \(Wales\) Act 2015](#) .

Should we not be protecting our green areas?

The Gwendraeth Valley was an industrial area and there is an abundance of brown-field sites within a short distance from this site which could accommodate the council's targets for housing. Why not concentrate on all these available areas before setting sights on the green fields? Not



only is it unsustainable but it's unacceptable that agricultural land is sacrificed.

What about all those empty buildings and shops in Rhydaman, Llanelli and Caerfyrddin?

Surely there are more suitable options for development across Carmarthenshire as a whole.

#### **4. Impact on neighbouring properties**

This proposed development would have an impact on the neighbouring properties.

Policy GP1 / LDP stresses the importance that a development is compatible to its surroundings:

*'the importance that developments are compatible with their surroundings in terms of scale, height, massing, and general topography of locality.... must not adversely affect local amenity in terms of visual impact, loss of light and privacy, disturbance and traffic movement....'*

This particular field is on a steep slope – the land rising suddenly from the level of the B4310 road below. What type of dwellings will be built there? Will they be bungalows or three storey houses? Will the roofs of the new properties tower over existing properties?

- *Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the settlement or its features (including views and glimpses both into and out of the settlement.)*

*Forward Planning statement in 2014.*

Two bungalows are sited adjacent to the site. Those living there are presently able to enjoy the view of the open countryside. However, it would not only be a case of loss of vista, privacy and light. There is a possibility that the properties could devalue overnight once dwellings are built directly in front of them.

All other properties on the old lane are of a linear pattern.

#### **5. Loss of drainage field**

Not only will developing this field be a loss of agricultural land but also mean that yet another important drainage field will be lost. This would

exacerbate existing serious problems with surface water in this part of the village.

All surface water flows from the developed area along the old lane and from surrounding area into this field. Very often large pools will appear on the field and once the field is saturated that surface water floods onto the B4310. Enclosed photos show this field after 4 hours of heavy rainfall on April 11<sup>th</sup> 2023.

The recommendation today is to refrain from developing not only sites within Flood Zones but land adjacent to Flood Zones.

The message is loud and clear. These fields are the important natural drainage areas and without them surface water problems will intensify.

We understand that a developer is expected to deal with surface water on site but from past experiences in this village that is definitely not the case!

## **6. Flood Zones**

At the Public Hearing (HS19) in April 2014 the Independent Planning Inspector requested that the Planning Authority confirm whether or not this particular field was within designated Flood Zones

as MAP argued.

*LPA to confirm whether alternative site ALT/159/006/N 'Land east of Llwyn Henry Farm' is within a TAN 15 DAM Flood Zone. This was done.*

*The map in Appendix 3 indicates the TAN 15 DAM Flood Zone maps for ALT/159/006/N*

*The southern and western sections of the site lie within Zone B, with a part of the site within Zone C2.*

Nothing has changed. The lower section of the field lies within designated Flood Zones B and C2.

Although this portion of the field is not included in this revised site, MAP hopes that consideration will be given to the argument presented.

## **7. Pipeline**

MAP is concerned about the proximity of this proposed allocation to the strategic main water pipeline from Nantgaredig Pumping Station to Felindre Water Treatment Works.

The Planning Consultant agreed back in 2014 that the pipeline 'skirts the site'.

MAP is aware that there should be a defined area of land on either side of the pipeline as a Buffer Zone or Corridor of Protection to protect the pipeline from damage.

Is it your opinion that the development of site SuV20/h1 would impinge on said Protection Corridor?

### **8. Proposed Entrance:**

Minor adjustments have been made to try and overcome some of the hurdles faced last time e.g. a new entrance proposed. It is now suggested that an opening be created to access the proposed site from the initial section of the lane near the junction thus avoiding site vehicles utilising the narrow one-track lane which is 10 – 12 feet in places.

This plan may have solved the issue regarding said lane to some extent, however, proposing a new access at this location raises further concerns.

A different entrance definitely does not erase all the other serious issues.

This is not an ideal location for an entrance. The B4310 is a busy road especially twice daily during peak times and visibility in both directions is poor.

The road from Glenfryn/ Derwen Deg towards the village square is narrow and winding with a sharp bend to cross the bridge. As a terrace of properties to the right hand side of the road towards the A40 junction have no off road parking spaces or garages, there is no option but to park cars on the roadside.

It is important to be aware of other possible developments (as well as housing developments) that would have an impact on traffic in the future. Should funding become available **SWTRA** will review Phase 2 of the plan to close or adapt junctions between Crosshands and Caerfyrddin – the Foelgastell Junction in both directions and the Llanddarog Junction from the direction of Caerfyrddin - resulting in a massive increase in vehicles

travelling through Porth-y-rhyd. All commuters from the neighbouring villages of Llanddarog, Llangyndeyrn, Cwm Mawr, Mynydd Cerrig, Foelgastell and Drefach will be using the B4310.

This is a quotation from a letter received from SWTRA.

'the closure of, or modifications to existing junctions will clearly result in traffic having to divert along minor roads and the implications of this needs to be fully taken into account.'

It is also important to keep in mind that each time an incident occurs on the A40 between Caerfyrddin and Crosshands traffic is diverted through Porth-y-rhyd. This occurs often.

## **9. Surface water problems**

One of the main concerns regarding developments on unsuitable sites in the village is the impact on existing surface water problems.

There is a history of flooding in the village dating back many years. An elderly resident in her 90's used to describe an incident that happened in her childhood . Her recollection was vivid - of a river flowing towards the square and how the residents in those properties had to open the back door for the water to flow through as there was no other option.

Shortly after work began on the development known as Clôs y Wennol a 'lake' appeared surrounding two of the dwellings in Cwm Cati. The Fire Brigade officer exclaimed that there was absolutely nowhere the water could flow to. That was not the only time problems occurred as a result of surface water. Elderly residents in Cwm Cati had to call on their neighbours on numerous occasions following heavy rainfall to help them mop up, clean and protect their properties.

Some fields are prone to ponding and large ponds appear following heavy rainfall on both this field and the Wernfraith proposed site.

Enclosed photos testify to the result of building on a Flood Zone and on a natural drainage field in the centre of the village. Other photos show the flooding that happened in 2009.

Residents are so fortunate that another site on a flood plain was turned down as an allocation for the LDP in 2019 as serious issues would have ensued. It was such a relief!

Surface water problems have existed in the area of this proposed development for years. All surface water flows from the sloped area behind and from the development along the old lane into this field which lies within flood zones. A portion to the southern side lies within zone C2 and an extensive area within zone B. Anecdotal evidence will confirm that this field is often saturated with a pond forming in the lower corner.

Where will all the surface water flow to once the field is under concrete?

Further along the road by the A40 junction to Caerfyrddin there is another development that has caused severe surface water problems. This nightmare for neighbouring householders came as the result of negligence and the lack of planning and monitoring as culverts and ditches were blocked and built on.

MAP has a file of correspondence recording twenty years of misery as this development which began in the 1990's is still ongoing and has not been adopted by the County Council.

As one resident noted : "It is true that a developer will claim to be able to sort out the problems on site but, as history has proven, in reality this is not the case and residents are left to their own devices to cope with the negative impact and consequences"

## **10. Sewerage System**

There has been a lot of publicity recently about discharging raw sewerage into rivers. According to Welsh Water data this occurred at Pontfaen 77 times in 2021. This number of course does not include those incidences when raw sewerage seeped accidentally onto fields and gardens as seen in the photos.

- The Pump at Pontfaen which pumps the waste to the treatment plant in Cwmisfael is unable to cope with the extra capacity although it was upgraded a few years ago. That is not surprising when one considers the increase in dwellings and the increase in volume of surface water flowing off concreted fields post developments.
- 40 dwellings have been built in the village since c.2000 – **an increase of 43%**

- All these properties were built but no upgraded work carried out to improve the system.
- How is the system expected to cope with further developments in Porth-y-rhyd and Llanddarog?

It must be remembered that **both** villages are on the same system!

- We appreciate that the Planning Authority carefully assess each individual application. However, it is felt that there is a need to view the wider picture.
- There is a plan to develop a site of 42 dwellings at Wernfraith - an alternative site allocated in the LDP 2006 – 2018. If this plan goes ahead there will be catastrophic impacts to the village in terms of the sewerage system and surface water.
- A small cluster of dwellings is now proposed for site SuV20/h1 and possibly for a site near Tŷ Cynheidre. It's imperative to count all proposed numbers of dwellings in order to fully appreciate the strain that will be on the present system – a system that is NOT coping at present.

Porth-y-rhyd	Wernfraith	42	
	SuV20/h1	6	6? 10? 14?
	Cynheidre	5 ?	
Llanddarog	SuV19/h1	16	(0.903 hectar)
	SuV19/h2	15	( 0.863 hectar)

The total (minimum) is 84 dwellings but could be far higher.

Imagine the strain on an already ineffective system.

And what about Windfall Sites? It's impossible to even hazard a guess at this stage!

Do you recall Porth-y-rhyd under threat sixty years ago back in 1963 when the Swansea Water Corporation wanted to drown the village?

Is there not a danger that the village will be drowned in 2023?

MAP contacted Welsh Water and as anticipated it was confirmed that upgrading work was required in most Welsh rural areas. Unfortunately there is no funding to carry out the improvements in the near future.

### **What will the situation be in the meantime?**

Weather patterns are changing and will become more extreme in the future. We and future generations will have to cope with the impact. It will be too late to change things once fields have disappeared under concrete.

The experts are in agreement that it is unwise to build on land adjacent to Flood Zones as these are of vital importance with drainage.

The message is crystal clear in the letter sent to all Planning Authorities in Wales by Julie James AS

(November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2021)

*Given the immediate and serious challenges posed by the climate emergency, a 'business as usual' approach ... is no longer a viable option. Taking meaningful action to address climate change will mean taking difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions. The planning system is at the forefront of responding to the climate emergency and ensuring the well-being of current and future generations.*

*The decisions local planning authorities make today will have a profound effect on how we adapt to climate change now and in the future. It is particularly important that we protect homes from flooding, when we know the devastating impact it can have on health and well-being.*

MAP appreciates the willingness of the Applicant to change and adapt plans.

MAP appreciates the decisions and recommendations made by Forward Planning officers .

### **HOWEVER**

- **despite the fact that the upper field has now been excluded**

**despite the fact that an attempt has been made to avoid the designated flood zone area**

- **and although the number of dwellings now proposed is more in line with what would be expected in a village the residents' concerns regarding the surface water and sewerage system OUTWEIGH the above amendments.**
- There is a strong feeling of opposition in the village as this field has been REFUSED in the past based on sound planning arguments and following a robust and rational site selection process.
- It was agreed that MAP register an **OBJECTION** to the inclusion of candidate site SuV20/h1 and kindly request that a representative / representatives be present at a Hearing Session during the Public Examination when this proposed site is discussed.

### **3. WERNFRAITH**

In the Additional Comments section it is stated: *This site is one of few opportunities in Porth-y-rhyd for new development, particularly with the **de-allocation** of the existing LDP allocation.*

It was so ironic to read this knowing full well that an application will shortly be submitted by the developers POBOL Group and Jones Henllan to build 42 dwellings on this site at Wernfraith Farm.

MAP has scrutinized the developers' plans for this site.

**The impact will be horrendous!**

In the meantime the residents participated in the Pre Application Consultation (PAC).

165 letters of **OBJECTION** were handed in to Evans Banks in addition to several emails sent.

It is the intention of the residents to **OPPOSE** this proposed development once a planning application is submitted.



<p><i>Ticiwch yma os ydych chi'n cyflwyno deunydd ychwanegol i gefnogi eich sylw.</i></p> <p>Tick here if you are submitting additional material to support your representation.</p>	Ydw
<p><b>6. Os ydych yn gwrthwynebu'r Cynllun Datblygu Lleol, ydych am siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad yr Archwiliad cyhoeddus?</b></p> <p><i>Ar y cam hwn, gallwch wneud sylwadau'n ysgrifenedig yn unig (gelwir y rhain yn 'sylwadau ysgrifenedig'). Fodd bynnag, gall pawb sydd am newid y Cynllun ymddangos gerbron yr Arolygydd a siarad mewn 'sesiwn gwrandawriad' yn ystod yr Archwiliad cyhoeddus. Ond dylech gofio y bydd yr Arolygydd yn rhoi'r un pwys ar eich sylwadau ysgrifenedig ar y ffurflen hon â'r rheiny a wneir ar lafar mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad. Sylwer hefyd y bydd yr Arolygydd yn pennu'r weithdrefn fwyaf priodol ar gyfer darparu ar gyfer y rhain sydd eisiau rhoi tystiolaeth lafar.</i></p> <p><b>6. If you are objecting to the LDP, do you want to speak at a hearing session of the public examination?</b></p> <p>At this stage, you can only make comments in writing (these are called 'written representations'). However, everyone that wants to change the Plan can appear before and speak to the Inspector at a 'hearing session' during the public examination. But you should bear in mind that your written comments on this form will be given the same weight by the Inspector as those made verbally at a hearing session. Please also note that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure for accommodating those who want to provide oral evidence.</p>	
<p><i>Nid wyf am siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad ac rwyf yn fodlon i'm sylwadau ysgrifenedig gael eu hystyried gan yr Arolygydd.</i></p> <p>I do not want to speak at a public hearing and am happy for my written representations to be considered by the Inspector.</p>	
<p><i>Rwyf am siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad.</i></p> <p>I want to speak at a public hearing.</p>	Ydwyf
<p><i>Os ydych chi eisiau cyfranogi mewn gwrandawriad, nodwch isod am beth rydych chi eisiau siarad (e.e. 'Safle Tai ym Mhen y Graig' neu 'Y targed tai cyffredinol').</i></p> <p>If you want to participate in a hearing, indicate below what you want to speak about (e.g. 'Housing site at Pen y Graig' or 'The overall housing target').</p>	
<p>Safle SuV20/h1</p>	
<p><b>7. Os ydych am siarad, byddai'n ddefnyddiol pe gallech nodi ym mha iaith yr hoffech gael eich clywed.</b></p> <p><b>7. If you wish to speak, it would be helpful if you could indicate in which language you would like to be heard.</b></p>	
<p><i>Rwy'n dymuno cael fy nghlywed yn Gymraeg.</i></p>	Ydw

I wish to be heard in Welsh.	
<i>Rwy'n dymuno cael fy nghlywed yn Saesneg.</i>	
I wish to be heard in English.	

## Nodiadau cyfarwyddyd

### Guidance notes

*Caiff Cynllun Datblygu Lleol Sir Gaerfyrddin ei archwilio gan Arolygydd annibynnol a benodir gan Lywodraeth Cymru. Gwaith yr Arolygydd yw ystyried a yw'r Cynllun yn bodloni **gofynion gweithdrefnol** ac a yw'n **gadarn**.*

*'Gellir ystyried 'Cadarn' yn y cyd-destun hwn o fewn ei ystyr arferol o 'dangos barnu da' a 'gellir ymddiried ynddo'. Y cwestiynau neu'r 'profion' y bydd yr Arolygydd yn eu hystyried wrth benderfynu a yw'r Cynllun yn gadarn yw:*

- 1. Ydy'r cynllun yn ffitio? (h.y. a yw'n gyson â chynlluniau eraill?)*
- 2. Ydy'r cynllun yn briodol? (h.y. a yw'n briodol ar gyfer yr ardal yng ngoleuni'r dystiolaeth?)*
- 3. A fydd y cynllun yn cyflawni? h.y. a yw'n debygol o fod yn effeithiol?)*

*Darperir rhagor o wybodaeth am y profion cadernid a gofynion gweithdrefnol yn Arweiniad Gweithdrefnol ar Archwiliadau Cynllun Datblygu Lleol yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio.*

*Os ydych yn gwrthwynebu, dylech ddweud pam rydych yn credu bod y Cynllun yn ansad a sut y dylid newid y Cynllun er mwyn ei wneud yn gadarn.*

*Lle cynigiwch newid i'r Cynllun, byddai o gymorth esbonio pa brawf/broffion cadernid y credwch y mae'r Cynllun yn eu methu. Os yw eich sylw yn perthyn i'r ffordd gafodd y Cynllun ei baratoi neu'r ffordd yr ymgynghorwyd arno, mae'n debygol y bydd eich sylwadau yn perthyn i 'ofynion gweithdrefnol'.*

*Fydd methu adnabod prawf ddim yn golygu na chaiff eich sylwadau eu*

The Carmarthenshire Revised Local Development Plan (LDP) will be examined by an independent Inspector appointed by the Welsh Government. It is the Inspector's job to consider whether the Plan meets procedural requirements and whether it is sound.

'Sound' may be considered in this context within its ordinary meaning of 'showing good judgement' and 'able to be trusted'. The questions or 'tests' which the Inspector will consider in deciding whether the Plan is sound are:

1. Does the plan fit? (i.e. is it consistent with other plans?)
2. Is the plan appropriate? (i.e. is it appropriate for the area in the light of the evidence?)
3. Will the plan deliver? (i.e. is it likely to be effective?)

More information on the soundness tests and procedural requirements is provided in the Planning Inspectorate's LDP Examinations Procedural Guidance.

If you are making an objection, you should say why you think the Plan is unsound and how the Plan should be changed to make it sound.

Where you propose a change to the Plan it would be helpful to make clear which test(s) of soundness you believe the Plan fails. If your comment relates to the way in which the Plan has been prepared or consulted on, it is likely that your comments will relate to 'procedural requirements'.

Failing to identify a test will not mean that your comments will not be considered, providing it relates to the

*hystyried, cyhyd â'i fod yn perthyn i'r Newidiadau Canolbwyntiedig. Dylech gynnwys eich holl sylwadau ar y ffurflen, gan ddefnyddio dogfennau ychwanegol a thystiolaeth ategol lle bod angen.*

*Os ydych yn ceisio am fwy nag un newid i'r Cynllun, nid yw bob tro yn angenrheidiol i lenwi ffurflenni ar wahân ar gyfer pob darn o'ch sylw. Fodd bynnag, gallai fod yn ddefnyddiol o bosibl i ddefnyddio dwy ffurflen ar wahân os ydych yn dymuno siarad mewn gwrandawriad am rai gwrthwynebiadau ond nid rhai eraill.*

*Pan fydd grŵp yn rhannu barn gyffredin ar sut mae'n dymuno i'r Cynllun gael ei newid, byddai'n ddefnyddiol i'r grŵp hwnnw anfon ffurflen unigol gyda'u sylwadau, yn hytrach na bod nifer fawr o unigolion yn anfon ffurflenni ar wahân yn ailadrodd yr un pwynt. Mewn achosion o'r fath, dylai'r grŵp nodi faint o bobl mae'n eu cynrychioli a sut gafodd y sylw ei awdurdodi. Dylid nodi cynrychiolydd y grŵp (neu'r prif ddeisebydd) yn glir.*

Plan or its supporting documents. You should include all your comments on the form, using accompanying documents and supporting evidence where necessary.

If you seek more than one change to the Plan, it is not always necessary to complete separate forms for each part of your representation. It may, however, be helpful to use two separate forms if you wish to speak at a hearing about some objections but not others.

Where a group shares a common view on how it wishes the Plan to be changed, it would be helpful for that group to send a single form with their comments, rather than for a large number of individuals to send in separate forms repeating the same point. In such cases the group should indicate how many people it is representing and how the representation has been authorised. The group's representative (or chief petitioner) should be clearly identified.