

## **Soundness Tests Appendix 2: Authority's response to Welsh Assembly Government comments**

### **Deposit Representations**

#### **Representation 1569/312**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

General

#### **Summary of Representation**

Relationship with to Neighbouring Areas: It is important that the strategies of the two LDPs in Pembrokeshire are compatible.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

No specific change is identified.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

At the meeting on the 22nd of July 2009 the Welsh Assembly Government advised that it is concerned about the relationship with the County Council's Plan and they would be seeking to ensure that Pembrokeshire County Council progresses to Deposit as rapidly as possible. This came as a surprise as an Officer of the Authority had been advised at the County Council's Key Stakeholder Panel meeting in December 2008 that there was considered to be no longer an issue with the timing of both Plans. Nevertheless Officers advised Welsh Assembly Government Officers regarding our intention to bring forward a proposed 'High Level' meeting programmed for September and to arrange regular meetings with Pembrokeshire County Council technical officers to ensure dovetailing of policy and background evidence on both sides.

Further updates on progress made can be read in agenda item 6 Core Group Papers for the 17th August 2009, agenda item 4 for the 16th September 2009 and agenda item 4 for the 11th November 2009.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Outstanding objections from the County Council relate to how affordable housing provision will impact on the Council as landowners and on detailed issues in relation to this Authority's waste policies. No objections have been received from Ceredigion County Council or Carmarthenshire County Council. The Authority continues to work with the County Council in relation to the development of the County's Local Development Plan and its relationship to the National Park Authority's Local Development Plan. Cross boundary issues and responses are discussed in the Tests of Soundness Background Paper - to be uploaded on the Authority's website in advance of Submission. No change is proposed.

#### **Representation 1569/317**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Chapter 4D

#### **Summary of Representation**

Housing/Affordable Housing: The approach to housing provision and affordable housing provision differs from national policy - WAG would suggest that the LDP examination should consider the robustness of the approach taken.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

No specific change is asked for but see note on further contact with the representor.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

A meeting was held on the 22 July 2009 where this Authority agreed to insert more information on

the implications of the projection work on the Plan and on quantifying emerging need.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

The representation acknowledges that the Authority provides an argument to support an approach different from National planning policy, and suggests that the strength of this argument be considered at Examination. In considering the robustness of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority approach, we would hope that the Inspector would also consider the robustness of the implied WAG position (that the 2006 based projections are likely to provide an accurate estimate of the Pembrokeshire population in 2021), the robustness of the Local Housing Market Assessment method, and to take into account that as of mid 2009, the Pembrokeshire County Council projection is the only methodologically robust projection published for the National Park. The Authority set out its criticisms of the Local Housing Market Assessment in the Housing Background paper and primarily rely on the Common Housing Register. As this Register does not identify emerging need, efforts will be made to address what are considered to be the shortcomings of the Local Housing Market Assessment prior to submission so that emerging need can be estimated. This information will be placed in the Housing Background Paper along with an assessment of the implications of projection work for the Plan. No change is proposed.

#### **Representation 1569/320**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 32

#### **Summary of Representation**

Policy 32: Housing: the NPA will need to revisit the population projections contained in the Plan to take account of the 2006 based household projections (with data for National Parks identified separately) which are due to be published shortly. (this includes the robustness of the significant windfall estimate of 250 dwelling units which doesn't appear to be evidenced - para 4.160).

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

Policy 32: Housing: the NPA will need to revisit the population projections contained in the Plan to take account of the 2006 based household projections (with data for National Parks identified separately) which are due to be published shortly. Clarify the derivation of 250 dwellings as a windfall figure.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

A meeting was held with the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd of July 2009 where the Authority agreed to insert more information on the implications of the various projection work. More information on windfall estimates which were prepared for the Deposit Plan are also being inserted into the Housing Background Paper for Submission.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

The Welsh Assembly Government has issued a 2006 based household projection for Local Authorities, including Pembrokeshire. The projection for Pembrokeshire has been used to derive a pro-rata projection for the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park. This shows an increase in the National Park Population from 22,300 in 2006 to 24,900 in 2021, and increase of around 2600. At the 2001 Census average household size was 2.26 persons. Using this figure, the population increase would roughly suggest an increase in households of about 1,150 over the period. However, a simple population based apportionment of growth from projections at a local authority or regional level is unlikely to result in a useful population forecast. The nature of the starting population and migrant population are different in the area in and outside the National Park. A population forecast prepared for the National Park area by Pembrokeshire County Council indicates the total number of National Park residents and households remaining more or less as it was at the 2001 Census. The Welsh Assembly Government Statistical Directorate are producing population projections for the National Parks in Wales using the same method as the Local Authority projections (by entering National Park base population, fertility, mortality and migration data into the projection model). It is the expectation of officers of the National Park Authority that this projection will be more similar to the Pembrokeshire County Council projection, indicating a

slight fall in population in the National Park, with household numbers remaining more or less stable. Until the Welsh Assembly Government projection is available the most useful projection for the National Park is that produced by Pembrokeshire County Council, and even when the Welsh Assembly Government projection is available it should be remembered that it won't necessarily be more reliable. The implications of these projections for the Plan will be considered in an updated Housing Background Paper prior to Submission.

The prediction of 250 windfall units over the plan period was based on the number of units added to the supply between 2003 and 2008 that were unlikely to have been identified and allocated in a Development Plan production process. An assumption was made that over the lifetime of the Plan the annual number of windfalls would decline and this decline was modelled using a number of mathematical formulae derived from the known number of windfalls in the years 2003/04 to 2007/08. The number of windfalls in 2008/09 is in accordance with the higher predictions from these formulae, and, though the volatility of the year on year figures would suggest not reading too much into this, it is unlikely that 250 over the years 2008 to 2021 is an optimistic prediction (a detailed account of this estimation is available and has been incorporated into the Housing Background Paper). No change is proposed.

### **Representation 1569/321**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 33

#### **Summary of Representation**

Policy 33 Affordable Housing: The robustness of relying on the Housing Register as the 'primary source of evidence of need' needs to be examined. The NPA needs to be confident on their viability analysis. Criterion d) - there is no firm date for when WAG will make a decision on its draft proposals to allow a commuted sum to be sought on single dwellings. There are no details on these proposals in the Plan.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

No specific change identified.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

Officers met with the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd of July 2009 and agreed the insertion of information in the Housing Background Paper on how the limitations of the Housing Market Assessment could be addressed particularly in relation to identifying arising need.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

See above re contact with the Welsh Assembly Government regarding what the Authority proposes. No change is proposed to the Local Development Plan.

With regard to the calculation of commuted sums the Authority is in the hands of the Welsh Assembly Government as to whether to include the criterion or not. If it is contained in final national planning policy then it would wish to take advantage of opportunities to secure contributions. How this would be calculated would be a matter of detail for supplementary planning guidance. If it is not contained in national planning policy then the Authority would not wish to pursue it.

No change is proposed.

### **Representation 1569/322**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 5

#### **Summary of Representation**

The justification for certain of the restrictions placed on development in the national park is not always apparent; the following are key examples:

- Rural Centres Settlement Boundaries - Policy 5 Rural Centres (Tier 4)

Policy 5 establishes a number of small Rural Centres for which settlement boundaries are included on the proposals map. It is not clear why settlement boundaries (and linked green wedges – see below) are required rather than relying on policies / criteria on development in the countryside (Policy 6).

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

See summary of representation.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

At a meeting with the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd of July the following explanation was provided.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Disagree. Without providing some definition as to what can be developed at Tier 5 then no certainty can be given that the land supply for Tier 5 (Rural Centres and Countryside) can be provided. This is a substantial contribution, an estimated 330 dwellings. Other agencies such as Welsh Water also need certainty as to what the likely future development in these locations will be. Without this they could only be considered as windfall contributions and given that this is a National Park the development management system would be under some difficulties in dealing with the level of representation that would be inevitable. Given the nature of many of the Centres the level of development that would be permissible would vary considerable. To encapsulate this in a criteria based policy would be very difficult. No change is proposed.

### **Representation 1569/323**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Paragraph 4.239

Paragraph 4.240

General

#### **Summary of Representation**

This representor suggests that the background evidence does not adequately justify why the proposed green wedges require extra protection. There should be a policy and justification in the plan to support the green wedge designations proposed.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

see summary of representation.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

A meeting was held with Welsh Assembly Government officers on the 22nd July 2009, where the need for an enabling policy for Green Wedges and further justification on why 'normal' policy would not be sufficient. Changes are proposed to address these concerns.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Planning Policy Wales emphasises the importance of openness as an attribute of Green Wedges and the maintenance of openness in the consideration of inappropriate development. Whilst there are policies within the plan which could allow development proposals outside Centres (e.g. Policy 15 Local Waste Management facilities, Policy 21 Renewable Energy, Policy 35 Low Impact Development Making a Positive contribution, Policy 36 Community Facilities, Policy 39 Garden Centres provide examples) they do not take into account openness when the acceptability of proposals is evaluated. Whilst in some areas policies of the plan are considered sufficient to resist development (as indicated in the green wedge site assessments), this is not the case for all evaluated Green Wedges. It is the designation as green wedge which resists inappropriate development which would otherwise erode that openness. This justification is considered too detailed to form part of the LDP, and it is proposed that the Background Paper on Green Wedges

be amended to incorporate this justification.

At a meeting with WAG on the 22nd July 2009, WAG stated that matters shown on the proposals map require an enabling policy. Paragraph 2.6.16 of Planning Policy Wales provides clear advice about inappropriate development and this is not intended to be repeated, although a cross reference could be helpful.

A new policy can be inserted after paragraph 4.240 advising: 'Existing Open Space and Green Wedges are shown on the Proposals Map'. Supporting text to this policy will need to advise that National Policy has been applied to reflect the local circumstances of the National Park and its rural nature, as follows 'Green Wedges play an important role in maintaining the landscape setting of urban and rural settlements, and in preserving openness. Pressures for development outside centre boundaries can result in an erosion of the openness and a detrimental effect on the character and special qualities of the rural National Park can result. Such development, alone or cumulatively can have a detrimental impact on the character and landscape of the National Park and provides justification for the designation of Green Wedges as a local interpretation of national policy'. An 'other' change is proposed.

### **Representation 1569/324**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 34

#### **Summary of Representation**

Policy 34 Gypsy Sites: Is there a need that is not being met? The policy wording requires editing.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

Additional sites for gypsies should be identified if a need is identified.

Policy: The criteria policy should be more positive and reasonable in line with guidance in WAG Circular 30/2007 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites'; at present a number of the criteria appear overly restrictive, for example criterion a) – identification of evidence of need should not be a determiner for consideration of a proposed site; criterion d) – no evidence to justify why a site should be flat (this is especially questionable if it is a more stringent requirement than is imposed for other types of caravan development); criterion e) overlap with licensing considerations in relation to layout / numbers.

- Policy justification: Paragraph 4.172 advises that the WAG site design guidance will be used by the authority; however, this is just one available standard and is essentially intended for WAG grant purposes rather than binding standards for each and every site. It is the site licensing regime operated under the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 which is the primary means of regulating standards on caravan sites including those used by Gypsies / Travellers. Suggest deletion of this paragraph.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

The Welsh Assembly Government emailed on the 31st July 2009.

In our meeting last Wednesday, there were a few issues which needed further clarification.

Firstly the Welsh Assembly's response to the Gypsy Sites (Policy 34) required further clarification - I have spoken to the relevant policy officer who has clarified the comments and I will attempt to outline these!

I reiterate the comment that the policy needs to be positive and reasonable - inline with guidance in Circular 30/2007.

In relation to criteria a) evidence of need to location or provide transitory arrangements in the area has been identified. National policy and guidance does not state that evidence of need should be a requirement - it is therefore felt that this criteria is unreasonable. The planning authority is required to determine applications for development from anyone who submits them (Annex B in the

Circular, page 22). You are therefore encouraged to delete this criteria.

d) the site is flat and suitable for the development and on site services facilities can be adequately provided. As land tends to have a natural slope there needs to be some flexibility with this criteria and adopt a common sense approach to how this would be applied.

e) the standard of design and layout is acceptable. We draw your attention to the licensing requirements which deal with internal arrangements on the site such as the size and positions of caravans.

One minor point is that Gypsy and Travellers should be spelt with capital letters.

With regard to the consultation undertaken on "meeting rural housing needs" last year - this was part of the preliminary work on TAN 6 to gain representations on housing issues. The outcome from this consultation has informed the redrafting of TAN 6 "Planning for sustainable rural communities" which is currently open for public consultation until 16 October.

I hope this is of help and clarifies the issues discussed. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require anything further.

Kind regards,  
Emma

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

A compromise is proposed. This Authority is awaiting publication of a Gypsy Study for Pembrokeshire by Pembrokeshire County Council. This was anticipated in June 09 but now there are discussions commencing regarding whether a consultant can be engaged to carry out the work for Pembrokeshire and other authorities in West Wales. If the outcome of that study is available in time then this can be fed into the Examination process.

Update October 2009: Pembrokeshire County Council has commissioned a survey of accommodation need to be conducted with the Gypsy Traveller community in Pembrokeshire. The survey is due to commence week beginning 26th October 2009 and is expected to take 4 to 6 weeks to be completed. It is hoped that up to 70 surveys will be completed in this time, although this is clearly dependent on the engagement of the Gypsy Traveller community.

The survey will be conducted by Azadeh, a company who manage local authority-owned Gypsy and Traveller sites and provide a range of support services across the UK, in conjunction with officers from the local authority who have established relationships with the community.

Once the surveys have been completed the results will be analyzed by the Planning and Housing departments within Pembrokeshire County Council with input from Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority to produce the Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment for Pembrokeshire. There is a target date for completion of the report by end of December 2009.

There is no opportunity left now for this Authority to act on the findings of the above study. The Plan has in any case a criteria based policy to deal with Gypsy Site proposals. If the Assessment is available at the time of submission then it can be submitted as a Background Document for the Inspector to consider and recommend any change to the Plan if considered necessary.

The five sites listed in the Plan are outside the National Park. The justification for deleting criterion a) in the email clarification above actually refers to the Welsh Assembly Government not approving of a criterion that advises 'Applications from Gypsies and Travellers with no local connection will not normally be allowed.' The supporting text quite rightly refers to the fact that Gypsies and Travellers are nomadic and do not necessarily have local connections. Given this context it is still argued by this Authority that the criterion is appropriate as it does not apply this restriction. The purpose of the criterion is to ensure that proposals for Gypsies and Travellers are planned for in a co-ordinated fashion and if there is a suitable plot already available in the area then it would be better to utilise this than create a new site on an ad hoc basis where there was no justification for it. This would not prevent Gypsies and Travellers providing a justification for why they needed to

be in that particular location, for example the need to have a transitory site for potato picking on the St David's peninsula.

Agree to deleting reference to the site needing to be 'flat' in criterion d) and deleting criterion e).

Agree to replace to reference in paragraph 4.172 as suggested. Agree to using capital letters for Gypsies and Travellers. An 'other change' is proposed.

## **Representation 1569/325**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

General

Paragraph 4.70

Policy 14

### **Summary of Representation**

This representor requests clarification of the presentation of Minerals Safeguarding Areas, Buffer Zones on the Proposals Map and clarify the wording of Policy 14, Inactive Minerals Sites.

### **Change to the Plan requested**

Distinguish the safeguarding minerals on the Proposals Map, include a policy for Buffer Zones and provide further information relating to Inactive Mineral sites.

### **Further contact with the Representor**

A meeting was held with Welsh Assembly Government officers on the 22nd July 2009, where it was requested that the plan states where the inactive mineral site is. Further exchange, by email with the WAG has resulted in further amendment to Inactive sites, and this is shown as a recommendation for this representation.

### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Mineral Safeguarding Areas: The types of mineral to be safeguarded can be shown separately on the Proposals Map, although paragraph 13 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales is not explicit in requiring that the mineral be distinguished. This is considered to be a minor editing change. Notwithstanding this, the Welsh Assembly Government research project 'Mineral Mapping Project for Wales' is due to be completed Dec 09 - Feb 2010 and is expected to influence the presentation, extent and approach to safeguarding through the publication of guidance and safeguarding maps.

Buffer Zones : (Para 4.70) Buffer zones are shown on the Proposals Map. The extent, purpose and control of development within buffer zones are clearly set out in Mineral Planning Policy Wales, Mineral Technical Advice Note 1 Aggregates and are cross referenced at page 37 of the Local Development Plan, the more recent Mineral Technical Advice Note 2 Coal could be added to this as a minor editing change. A new Policy can be included to explain that the approach in national planning policy is being followed. See response to 1633/523 where it is listed as an 'other change.' It is repeated here for the sake of transparency:

#### **Buffer Zones**

Buffer Zones around active and inactive mineral extraction sites are shown on the proposals map.

#### **Reasoned Justification.**

Buffer Zones are defined in accordance with Minerals Planning Policy Wales (paragraph 40), Minerals Technical Advice Note 1 Aggregates (paragraphs 70 and 71) and Minerals Technical Advice Note 2 Coal (paragraphs 32 and 33) and serve the purposes set out in National Guidance. Consideration of planning proposals within Buffer Zones will be inline with National Guidance.

The South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party Annual report (Minerals background paper references) identifies the location and type of material quarried within the National Park. The view of the Inspector on the need to repeat this information within a locational policy would be welcomed

Inactive Mineral sites: The site identified as unlikely to be reopened, is Penberry near St Davids. This site is shown as dormant within the Minerals Background Paper (extracted from the South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party Annual Report 2007). The sites indicated as inactive at 2007, do not meet the tests in relation to Prohibition Orders. Syke Walwyns Castle is currently active, and the owner of Bottom Meadow has indicated he will reopen the site. It would not be appropriate to refer to these sites within the LDP under this policy. Whilst the Authority has set out intentions for the dormant site, no further detail can be provided until investigations are progressed. Minor editing change can be made however to refer to the site shown on the proposals map at 4.78 to read 'The inactive site at Penberry near St Davids is shown on the Proposals Map'.

Inactive Mineral Sites: Some discussion has taken place with the Welsh Assembly Government, and a minor editing change is proposed to introduce additional text to the Plan at paragraph 4.78 to refer to Bottom Meadow Quarry as being currently inactive (despite the owners desire to start working) and to add that other inactive sites will be kept under review to ensure high standards of environmental protection appropriate to a National Park are maintained as follows - 'Bottom Meadow Quarry is currently inactive (October 2009). Other inactive sites will be kept under review to ensure high standards of environmental protection appropriate the National Park are maintained.'

### **Representation 1569/326**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Table 3

Table 7

Table 10

Table 9

Paragraph 4.70

#### **Summary of Representation**

Locational Policy Omissions

Several instances occur where the text of the deposit LDP written statement refers to matters that are included on the Proposals Map but have not been supported by locational or enabling policies.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

Locational Policy Omissions

Several instances occur where the text of the deposit LDP written statement refers to matters that are included on the Proposals Map but have not been supported by locational or enabling policies:

- a. ☐ proposed allocations at Table 3 employment / mixed use sites (page 58); Table 7 housing sites (page 67); Table 9 community facilities (page 73); table 10 road and cycle schemes (page 77);
- b. ☐ buffer zones (minerals) at para 4.70;

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

At a meeting with the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd of July 2009 the Welsh Assembly Government clarified that wherever the Authority shows something on the Proposals Map there has to be an enabling policy. This can be as simple as x, y, z is shown on the Proposals Map is the policy context is adequately set out in national planning policy. If there is a more local interpretation of policy then additional wording is needed.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Agree. Insert at the end of Policy 30c)... 'Employment and mixed allocations listed in Table 3 below are shown on the Proposals Map. In Policy 32 before the last sentence insert 'Allocations for housing are listed in Table 7 and are shown on the Proposals Map.' In Policy 36 at the end of the Policy insert 'Allocations for community facilities are listed in Table 9 and are shown on the Proposals Map.' At the end of Policy 40 advise 'Allocations for road and cycle schemes are listed



in Table 10 and shown on the Proposals Map. These are minor editing changes. Representation 1569/325 sets out how a new policy on Buffer Zones will be included.

#### **Representation 1569/328**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests C2;CE1;CE2

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 7

#### **Summary of Representation**

Policy 7 - ensure the policy's remit does not extend beyond the boundary of the National Park.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

The reference to "or impacting on" in the first line Policy 7 should be deleted as this implies the LDP seeks to control development beyond the National Park boundary which is inappropriate. The last sentence of paragraph 4.55 could then be amended to make it clear that the NPA will apply the same principles as set out in Policy 7 in commenting on development proposals outside of the National Park. (The same issue applies to the last sentence in paragraph 4.236).

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Agree with what the objector proposes. An 'other' change is proposed.

#### **Representation 1569/329**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests CE2;CE3;CE4

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 6

#### **Summary of Representation**

i. Policy 6 – Countryside (Tier 5) Criterion d of Policy 6 is supported by detail provided in footnote 83. The inclusion of "holiday accommodation" as "residential" is not commonly understood. Indeed, paragraph 1.77 in Appendix 1 suggests it is "seen as an employment related use". Consequently, it appears to be a departure from national policy of seeking employment uses before residential ones and this approach needs clear justification in the policy's supporting text.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

i. Policy 6 – Countryside (Tier 5) Criterion d of Policy 6 is supported by detail provided in footnote 83. The inclusion of "holiday accommodation" as "residential" is not commonly understood. Indeed, paragraph 1.77 in Appendix 1 suggests it is "seen as an employment related use". Consequently, it appears to be a departure from national policy of seeking employment uses before residential ones and this approach needs clear justification in the policy's supporting text.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

At a meeting with the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd of July 2009 the following explanation/suggestion was put forward.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Paragraph 7.6.10 of Planning Policy Wales provides for the option of prioritising employment related uses. It is not a requirement. This Authority has attempted to prioritise employment related uses under the Joint Unitary Development Plan and found this difficult to operate. Beyond holiday letting there is little demand for employment related activities. The Authority could also not rationalise not allowing affordable housing provision as a first option given the need for affordable housing and yet the Authority would allow holiday let (considered to be an employment related use in the Joint Unitary Development Plan (this is the reference in Appendix 1)). The reasoned justification could usefully include some text on this issue. An 'other' change is proposed.

## **Representation 1569/330**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests CE2;CE3;CE4

### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 47

General

### **Summary of Representation**

This representor questions whether the approach at Policy 47 accords with Planning Policy Wales.

### **Change to the Plan requested**

It is not clear what specific change this representor is requesting.

### **Further contact with the Representor**

A meeting was held with officers of the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd July where the role of the Local Record Centre in this process was discussed. The Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) requested additional text in the Reasoned Justification which clearly specified that this was the source to be used and in some way if we could provide a sample of how it works in practice/and looks when mapped. The officer recommendation is intended to accommodate the outcome of this meeting.

### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Agree with representation. Further text can be provided to the reasoned justification at 4.222 regarding the role and involvement of the Local Record Centre in informing biodiversity for planning decisions. In some cases there will be no important local conservation interest, but in others it will need to be taken into account from an up to date record base. 'The Local Record Centre records can be particularly useful at pre-application stage and the public are encouraged to contact the centre before an application is submitted. The Authority will use the Local Record Centre to establish whether there is local nature conservation interest at a development site. Where there is local nature conservation interest which would be significantly harmed, the potential for mitigating, satisfactorily minimising or off setting will need to be investigated by the developer and demonstrated to the Authority'. An 'other change' is proposed.

A Biodiversity Background Paper will be published prior to submission which will help to set out this process including the involvement and information provided to the Local Record Centre, and how the Authority will take it into account.

## **Representation 1569/331**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests CE2;CE3;CE4

### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Chapter 5

### **Summary of Representation**

Implementation and Monitoring: Mechanisms indicated in the Plan require clarification.

### **Change to the Plan requested**

The monitoring framework (appendix 4) provides a number of targets and indicators in relation to the plan's key outcomes and a number of related policies and WAG core indicators are included; however, it would be preferable for annual housing targets to be specified rather than targets for the entire plan period (page 33, Appendix 4).

- The likelihood that the transport schemes in Table 10 (page 77) will be delivered during the Plan period should be verified to ensure they will not result in unnecessary blight.

- In relation to sewage capacity and infrastructure provision, paragraph 1.53 in Appendix 1 states: "Sewage disposal is considered an issue at certain locations in the National Park and will need addressing to accommodate further development at certain villages and towns in the Park". The Authority needs to be confident these issues are not insurmountable and that they will not prevent sites coming forward at the point envisaged. There is a related issue concerning the delivery of

affordable housing (a priority of the deposit plan) where required improvements are not contained in Dwr Cymru's programme of improvements (due in November 2009) and developer contributions would be required for implementation as specified in relation to a number of allocations at Appendix 2.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

A meeting was held with the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd July 2009 where Officers outlined the following proposed recommendation.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Agree to putting in annual targets for housing. This is considered to be a minor editing change. In terms of sewage disposal issues the Authority has identified those as clearly as it can with the benefit of clarification from Welsh Water and the Environment Agency. Given the timescales to which Welsh Water work to this inevitably gets updated programme by programme. Please see evidence from Pembrokeshire County Council in an updated Sustainable Transport Background Paper in relation to road schemes listed in Table 10.

### **Representation 1569/332**

Representor considers the Plan Not stated after applying soundness tests CE2;CE3;CE4

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 22

#### **Summary of Representation**

Policy 22 – Flooding and Coastal Inundation

Although flood risk appears to be considered adequately in the strategy and allocations as well as in the monitoring indicators (appendix 4), it is not clear how TAN 15 policy would be applied to Environment Agency flood zones 2 and 3 (at section a of policy 22). The approach advocated does not appear logical because the tests contained in TAN 15 are triggered by the zones in the Development Advice Maps. It is difficult, therefore, to judge whether this policy is in line with national policy.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

No specific change proposed.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

Meeting with Elaine Ancrum, Mark Newey and Emma Gladstone to discuss the representations and responses on 22nd July 2009.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

The policy is intended to give additional protection beyond the areas identified by the TAN15 Development Advice Maps by including areas identified as having potential to flood through the Environment Agency's Flood Maps, zones 2 and 3 and the emerging Shoreline Management Plan 2s which also take into account the latest predicted sea-level rises. It is considered that the application of the exceptions to the restrictions on development outlined in TAN15 would remain relevant within the wider area identified by all three sources of flood information. It is proposed that the Plan is amended to refer to the Development Advice Maps and add the following to footnote 111 "The Development Advice Maps (2009) identify areas liable to flood based on historic events (Zone B) and the Environment Agency's flood zone 2 (Zones C1 and C2). The Environment Agency's flood maps zones 2 and 3 identify the probability of areas flooding based on modelled data. The emerging Shoreline Management Plan 2s will identify areas liable to flood from the sea, with a long timescale. The data from all three sources will be used to identify areas liable to flooding for the purposes of this policy." An other change is proposed.

### **Representation 1569/333**

Representor considers the Plan Not stated after applying soundness tests CE2;CE3;CE4

#### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Chapter 4A

### **Summary of Representation**

This representor questions whether enough land is identified to meet in house waste facilities.

### **Change to the Plan requested**

This representor appears to seek amendment to the plan to justify the shortfall in provision for local waste management facilities.

### **Further contact with the Representor**

This representation was discussed at the meeting with officers of the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd July. The proposed response to the representation was supplied to WAG on the 28th July 09, and comments are awaited.

### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Disagree with representation. Paragraph 4.81 provides the current position regarding the redevelopment of the Tenby Civic Amenity site, which is currently 0.13 Ha and requires an enlarged facility, the proposed size of which is unknown. This Authority is not the Waste Management Authority, and prior to firm plans has provided the best available information in relation to the Tenby redevelopment at paragraph 4.81, and a criteria based policy 15 to provide flexibility in planning for firm proposals when they become available. No change is proposed.

### **Representation 1569/334**

Representor considers the Plan Not stated after applying soundness tests CE2;CE3;CE4

### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Policy 44

### **Summary of Representation**

Policy 44 Telecommunications: The policy wording goes beyond the guidance set out in TAN 19.

### **Change to the Plan requested**

More justification is therefore required to support the latter section of the proposed policy 44.

Delete paragraph 4.209.

More justification is required to support the standard requirement at paragraph 4.210.

### **Further contact with the Representor**

This representation was discussed with Welsh Assembly Government officials at a meeting on 22nd July 2009 and concluded that the response set out below reflects the National Park Authority's position.

### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Approve compromise position - It is agreed that the requirement for removal of all apparatus is contained in the Electronic Communications Code (2003) and therefore the reference to the need for a condition to that effect is surplus to requirement and can be deleted. It is also agreed that paragraph 4.209 can be deleted as this is also a statutory requirement under Article 5A of the Procedure Order. This can be regarded as a minor editing change. With regard to the third element of this objection relating to the latter section of Policy 44 was tested at the Inquiry into the Joint Unitary Development Plan for Pembrokeshire and remains valid here. See Authority's evidence in the extract from the JUDP Inspector's Report (Section 7.4 Telecommunications) which can be found in the Plan's Background Papers for Submission. Minor editing change is proposed.

### **Representation 1569/335**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests CE2;CE3;CE4

### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Appendix 2

### **Summary of Representation**

#### Appendix 2 – Allocations

Some of the allocations referenced in the body of the written statement do not appear to be referred to in Appendix 2: i.e. MA706, MA232, MA777, HA609, HA385, HA436, RI7.

#### Change to the Plan requested

##### Appendix 2 – Allocations

Some of the allocations referenced in the body of the written statement do not appear to be referred to in Appendix 2: i.e. MA706, MA232, MA777, HA609, HA385, HA436, RI7.

#### Further contact with the Represantor

The Welsh Assembly Government were concerned (meeting 22 July 2009) that there may have been an administrative error and the information on sites had been accidentally excluded.

#### Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response

Information is only added here if it is thought that it is needed. A sentence could be inserted at the beginning of Appendix 2 Allocations advising 'Where considered necessary further advice is provided on some of the allocations proposed in the Plan.' This is considered to be a minor editing change.

#### Representation 1569/336

Represantor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests Not Given

#### Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan

General

#### Summary of Representation

Editing/inconsistencies/minor points.

#### Change to the Plan requested

Editing / inconsistencies / minor points:

- Footnote 79 - The footnote does not appear to match with the wording of Policy 6a). The former refers to "Rounding off" while the latter refers to "minor extensions". There should be consistency. (Policy 33c refers to "rounding off" while the Housing MIPPS refers to "minor extensions".)
- Table 8 page 68 - "St Ishmaels HA733" should be amended to "St Ishmaels MA733" – i.e. it is a mixed-use site proposal.
- Policy 37 - Retail in the National Park - the penultimate paragraph should say "are identified" rather than "will be identified".
- Policy 40 – Sustainable Traffic - in criterion d - "see Policy 41" should be in brackets.
- Para 4.227 - states that 'protecting historic landscapes, parks or gardens and their setting' are shown on the Proposals Map; however, they are not shown on the proposals map.
- Appendix 4 Monitoring (page 35) – the policy references should be policy 45 not policy 44 for Special Qualities - 'Landscape, Biodiversity, Historic and Natural Environment and Welsh Language'.

#### Further contact with the Represantor

Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority Officers advised that these minor editing changes were acceptable at the meeting on the 22nd July 2009.

#### Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response

Agree regarding the point raised on 'minor extensions'. Add in brackets after minor extensions (i.e. rounding off). Agree re Table 8 minor edit for MA733 and Policy 40. Also agree showing historic parks landscapes etc. on the Proposals Map (This will need an enabling policy - It is proposed to insert a policy between paragraphs 4.227 and 4.228 which advises 'Historic landscapes, Parks and Gardens are shown on the Proposals Map) and to correct the cross reference in the Monitoring section. These are considered to be minor editing changes. Policy 37 reasoned justification is not proposed for change as the sentence in question already states that the boundaries 'are' identified.

## **Representation 1569/1148**

Representor considers the Plan Unsound after applying soundness tests None recorded

### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

General

#### **Summary of Representation**

Several instances occur where the text of the deposit LDP written statement refers to matters that are included on the Proposals Map but have not been supported by locational or enabling policies - here the issue relates to showing Green Wedges and Open Space.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

Locational Policy Omissions

Several instances occur where the text of the deposit LDP written statement refers to matters that are included on the Proposals Map but have not been supported by locational or enabling policies:

- c. □green wedges at para 4.240;
- d. □open space at para 4.240. In addition, it is not clear whether allocations on the proposals map are existing or additional provision.

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

At a meeting with the Welsh Assembly Government on the 22nd of July 2009 the Welsh Assembly Government clarified that wherever the Authority shows something on the Proposals Map there has to be an enabling policy. This can be as simple as x, y, z is shown on the Proposals Map is the policy context is adequately set out in national planning policy. If there is a more local interpretation of policy then additional wording is needed.

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Open space shown in the Plan is existing space. A new policy can be inserted after paragraph 4.240 advising: Existing Open Space and Green Wedges are shown on the Proposals Map. Supporting text to this policy will need to advise that National Policy has been applied to reflect the local circumstances of the National Park and its rural nature, as follows 'Green Wedges play an important role in maintaining the landscape setting of urban and rural settlements, and in preserving openness. Pressures for development outside centre boundaries can result in an erosion of the openness and a detrimental effect on the character and special qualities of the rural National Park can result. Such development, alone or cumulatively can have a detrimental impact on the character and landscape of the National Park and provides justification for the designation of Green Wedges as a local interpretation of national policy'. An 'other change' is proposed.

## **Alternative Sites Representations**

### **Representation 1569/151A**

Representor considers the Plan Not stated after applying soundness tests Not Given

### **Representation refers to the following elements of the Plan**

Alt854 Land westside of Sandy Haven Rd, Herbrandston

#### **Summary of Representation**

The Welsh Assembly Government's Rural Affairs Technical Services Department advises that this site is shown as grade 2 on the ALC map of the area, if confirmed to come within the "best and most versatile" category.

#### **Change to the Plan requested**

N/A

#### **Further contact with the Representor**

N/A

#### **Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority response**

Comments are noted. The Authority is not proposing to amend the Plan to include this alternative site.