

Number: **WG26326**



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

www.gov.wales

Welsh Government

Consultation – summary of responses

Local Development Plans Process Review

Date of issue: **September 2015**

Overview

This document provides a summary of the responses received by the Welsh Government to the Local Development Plans Process Review – consultation.

Audience

Businesses, consultants, local planning authorities, government agencies and other public sector bodies, professional bodies, interest groups, the voluntary sector, representative bodies and individuals with an interest in the planning system.

Action Required

For information only.

Further Information

Enquires about this document should be directed to:

Plans Branch
Planning Directorate
Welsh Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff CF10 3NQ

Email: planningconsultations-c@wales.gsi.gov.uk

Additional Copies

This document can be accessed from the Welsh Government website at:
www.gov.wales/consultations/planning/local-development-plans-process-review/?status=closed&lang=en

Contents

Page number

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. What was the consultation about?**
- 3. Why are we proposing change?**
- 4. What are the main changes we are proposing?**
- 5. Next Steps**
- 6. Detail of responses**
- 7. Summary of the Key Themes / Issues**
- 8. Statistical Breakdown and Overview of the Responses to Each Question**

Annex A
Full List of Respondents

Annex B
Statistical Overview of All Responses

1. Introduction

- 1.1 A consultation exercise on the local development plan refinement work was launched on 1 October 2014 and was open for responses for 12 weeks until 2 January 2015.
- 1.2 The LDP Process Refinement Exercise (PRE) had already benefited from the experience of many local planning authorities (LPAs) and others who have been involved in the preparation of a significant number of LDPs over recent years. The LDP PRE Report (WG, 2013) was published before this consultation and provided a summary of this extensive stakeholder engagement together with the key outcomes that were identified (section 6 of the Report). This report provides the basis for the changes proposed in this consultation.
- 1.3 Building on good practice, experience and lessons learnt to ensure a more efficient and effective process, we are proposing to take forward all the key outcomes from the LDP PRE Report (at paras 6.2&6.3).
- 1.4 A total of 12 questions were asked, 11 based on the main changes and the final question sought further comments should respondents wish to provide additional observations or expand upon their previous answers.
- 1.5 This consultation summary report details the responses to the LDP refinement work and remains separate to the ongoing Planning (Wales) Act 2015 work and does not cover primary legislation matters e.g. National Development Framework or Strategic Development Plans.

2. What was the consultation about?

- 2.1 Following initial work with stakeholders it was proposed we took forward all the **key outcomes** identified in the PRE Report through a combination of amendments to secondary legislation and to national guidance. This resulted in changes aimed to:
 - a) **Increase and improve front-loading of the process**, with a more integrated approach to incorporating sustainability appraisal / strategic environmental assessment (SA/SEA) fully into LDP preparation, a more informative Preferred Strategy and a requirement for sites being brought forward at the early stages of the process negating the need for the 'Alternative Site' (Reg.20&21) stage.
 - b) **Reduce the required stages for plan revision**, by introducing a short-form more proportionate procedure for making partial revisions to an adopted LDP where the issues involved are not of sufficient significance to warrant the full procedure, notably where the strategy remains sound.
 - c) **Repackage the soundness tests** for clarity and simplicity.

- d) Provide greater clarity in relation to the **robust evidence base, deliverability, monitoring and review.**

3. Why are we proposing change?

- 3.1 The Welsh Government does not intend to make changes to the LDP process that would increase plan preparation complexity or the time required for plan preparation; rather the intention is to focus on ensuring an efficient and positive process. It has been anticipated from the outset that, guided by contributions from stakeholders, there will need to be changes to published LDP guidance with a focus on post adoption procedures. This refinement exercise is not about a whole-scale change of the system, rather one of building on good practice, experience, and lessons learnt to ensure the process is as efficient and effective as possible. The LDP PRE project was commenced to benefit from the experience of a wealth of stakeholders who have been involved in the preparation of a significant number of LDPs since October 2005 when the LDP provisions of Part 6 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 were fully commenced.
- 3.2 This project also fulfils the Welsh Government's committed actions relating to the development plan system as contained in the Welsh Government's Written Response to the Sustainability Committee's Report on Planning (9 March 2011– http://www.assemblywales.org/bus-home/bus-third-assembly/bus-committees/bus-committees-scrutiny-committees/bus-committees-third-sc-home/inquiries_sd/sc3_inq_planning.htm) in particular recommendations 17, 18, 20, 22 and 24.
- 3.3 Welsh Government set up an Independent Advisory Group (IAG) in 2011 to prepare a review of planning delivery (including plan making) which provided part of the evidence base for a Consultation Paper for the Planning (Wales) Act 2015. Whilst the IAG work is separate to the LDP PRE, the LDP PRE has fed into the IAG Call for Evidence (Nov'11), and the resultant IAG Report, "Towards a Welsh Planning Act: Ensuring the Planning System Delivers" (June'12), has fed into the LDP PRE. This extended the required time for the PRE analysis work to ensure that all issues have been considered.
- 3.4 The LDP PRE is separate to the Planning (Wales) Act 2015 work and does not cover primary legislative matters, and therefore comments received in relation to the content of the Act have not been included in this refinement work.

Stages of the LDP PRE

Stage 1 – Desktop trawl resulting in schedule of matters for consideration

Stage 2 – Stakeholder questionnaire (*Oct-Nov'11*)

Stage 3 – Focussed stakeholder workshops (*Nth & Sth Wales – Dec'11*)

Stage 4 – Analysis of outcomes (including considering IAG Report) (identifying recommendations)

Stage 5 – Report (prepared in collaboration with Stakeholder Sounding Board)

Stage 6 – Revisions to published guidance and secondary legislation following consultation (LDPW / LDP Manual / Public Guide / LDP Regulations)

4. What were the main changes proposed?

4.1 Other changes specifically affecting the LDP Regulations included:

e). Resources: regard should be had to the resources available or likely to be available to deliver the policies and proposals set out in the LDP (at Reg13). (This is key given that LDP strategies should be deliverable within the plan period.)

f). End date: a requirement that the LDP sub-title indicate 'the end date of the LDP period' (i.e. the end of the period for which the LDP is planning) at Reg11(1)(b).

g). Notice: remove the requirement to "give notice by local advertisement"; meaning "by publication on at least one occasion in a local newspaper circulating in the whole of the area of the LPA". (e.g. at Reg22(5)(b); Reg23(1)(c); 24(2)(b); 25(2)(c); 26(b)). This will not reduce the level of publicity given to the LDP, as this will be suitably addressed in the Delivery Agreement through its Community Involvement Scheme.

h). Savings / transitional provisions: ensure that amendments to the Regulations do not delay the momentum of plan preparation or disadvantage anyone.

4.2 Other changes proposed to the LDP documentation include:

i). Revised and succinct guidance package which will serve to provide clear focussed guidance for plan-makers and those participating in the process (realising that much of the basic guidance on the process is no longer necessary given that the LDP system has been in force for the best part of a decade); this **includes:**

- Locating revised key policy on the LDP process in a single location in Planning Policy Wales (Ch.2) rather than the current spread between it and LDP Wales, thereby eliminating LDP Wales; the LDP Manual including all necessary guidance.
- Eliminating the 'main themes for the LDP system' currently at chapter 2 of the LDP Manual.

j). **Consultees:** listings of statutory and other consultees.

5. Next Steps

5.1 This Consultation Summary Report is published alongside the revised LDP regulations; Planning Policy Wales (Chapter 2); and LDP Manual.

5.2 PPW chapter 2, LDP Wales and the current LDP Manual (2006) will be cancelled.

6. Details of Responses

6.1 All responses have been considered fully in preparing the revised LDP regulations and national guidance.

6.2 The consultees were drawn from the core stakeholders consultation list held by the Planning Directorate of the Welsh Government. These stakeholders included all local planning authorities in Wales, together with relevant public bodies, businesses, special interest groups, professional bodies and other interest groups (and were listed with the consultation package “Consultation list”). The consultation documentation was made available on the Welsh Government consultation website on 1 October 2014 until 2 January 2015 - <http://gov.wales/consultations/planning/local-development-plans-process-review/?status=closed&lang=en>.

6.3 In total, 54 consultation responses were received.

Type of organisation	Numbers responded
Businesses	5
Local Planning Authorities	22
Government Agency/Other Public Sector	8
Professional Bodies / Interest Groups	10
Voluntary Sector	5
Other	4
TOTAL	54

6.4 **Appendix A** includes a list of all respondents. Copies of the individual consultation responses are available on request.

6.5 A statistical overview of responses is available in Annex B.

7. Summary of the Key Themes / Issues

7.1 The respondents were mostly in support of the proposed changes.

8. Statistical Breakdown and Overview of the Responses to Each Question

8.1 A summary of the key findings under each consultation question is set out below. This section provides a detailed summary and analysis of the key themes generated for each question followed by the Welsh Government's response.

Q1. With the proposed greater front-loading of the process in terms of sites and a more defined and informative Preferred Strategy, do you agree that no-one would be disadvantaged by the elimination of the 'alternative sites' stage (Regulations 20 & 21)?

Question 1	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	35	5	8	6
Business	0	2	1	2
LPA	20	1	1	0
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	0	3	1
Professional Body/Interest Group	7	2	0	1
Voluntary Sector	3	0	1	1
Other	1	0	2	1
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

65% of respondents agreed that no-one would be disadvantaged with the elimination of the alternative site stage (regulation 20 & 21) with only 9% disagreeing. The largest group responding positively to this question was the LPAs with 20 in favour of this proposal.

Overview

The majority of respondents agreed that no one would be disadvantaged with the removal of the alternative site stage especially with the proposed greater front-loading of the process in terms of sites and a more defined and informative Preferred Strategy. Many respondents confirmed that this stage had caused confusion. However, many (from LPAs, professional bodies and voluntary sector) recognised that early engagement needed to be improved and that early engagement to date had not worked to reduce the number of respondents later on in the process. One from the business community also wished to have the opportunity to respond to candidate sites on any submission prior to a formal consultation.

The following concerns were raised:

- By removing Alternative Sites stage it denies an opportunity to object to site changes the Inspector may wish to make; this opportunity to comment on potential changes to the Deposit Plan was considered to be a fundamental principle of the LDP process.
- Risk to a legal challenge by changing the process during the preparation of the plan.
- Without more information included at preferred strategy and certainty that sites would be included in the adopted plan, developers are unable to commit resources to sites and considered that it would be necessary to undertake an examination of the Preferred Strategy to ensure developers engage early in the process.
- The process would become inflexible as sites could not be included at the later stages of the process when sites become available for developers.

Welsh Government Response

This stage has caused confusion among stakeholders and does not add value to the development plan process. This was highlighted by some of the respondents misunderstanding what this stage entailed. For this reason those authorities already started on their plans will be able to proceed under new regulations. The process allows for an opportunity to amend the LDP e.g. adding/ deleting sites during the examination. Further consultation can take place on matters raised during the examination (matters arising changes).

Guidance has been amended to further emphasise the importance of early engagement, and to include more information at preferred strategy. Guidance also clarifies the Inspector's role at examination and how any changes (including additional sites) are accommodated in the process.

Q2. Do you agree that the LPA should prepare and publish a Review Report to justify whether a full or partial plan revision is appropriate, and that this should form part of the package of required documents at pre-deposit, deposit and submission?

Question 2	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	36	1	11	6
Business	4	0	0	1
LPA	17	1	3	1
Govt Agency/Other PS	5	0	3	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	6	0	4	0
Voluntary Sector	2	0	0	3
Other	2	0	1	1

Total Responses:				54
-------------------------	--	--	--	-----------

Statistical Review

This question generated a positive response across all sectors with 67% agreeing that LPAs should prepare and publish a Review Report.

Overview

Many of the responses received considered this to be an essential tool to ensure transparency and clarity in the review process. It was considered that the review report would succinctly explain and justify the reasons for needing/ or not to change a plan and would become the core document to underpin the LDP review process.

Further clarification was sought on the following issues:

- Whether statutory consultation should be required on the Report Review? – some were unclear as to what the procedures were in relation to preparing the report and consulting on it;
- Whether guidance could include further information relating to the type of engagement envisaged;
- Scale of evidence required to inform the report;
- Timescale for the preparation of the review report;
- Whether the guidance included enough information in relation to the expectations of ‘engagement’ in the process;
- WG/PINS role in the review report – formal consultation/ representation on the report/ confirmation on conclusion on the revision process;
- On whether the review report would be part of the consultation package;
- The term “local circumstances” could introduce ambiguity to the system;
- Status of the current LDP policies once a draft report has been issued;
- The inspector’s ability to widen the scope of the examination;
- On the extent of the examination and the scope of the review report.

The one authority which disagreed considered this to be an unnecessary exercise as the AMRs would justify the need to review the plan and that a Review Report could become a time consuming exercise, particularly given that the timescale for the short form review is only twelve months.

Welsh Government Response

The Welsh Government will proceed to make legislative provisions to require a Review Report to justify the type of revision process the authority decides to take including provisions for selective plan review.

The Welsh Government has made amendments to the LDP Manual to clarify the issues raised by the consultation. It is not considered necessary to have a statutory consultation stage for the Review Report. Having engaged with key stakeholders the authority can react to the views raised by key stakeholders in the review report. The review report will be one of the consultation documents for the formal consultation stages in both the short and full review. Welsh Government will provide an informal view on a draft Review Report and will highlight issues of concern especially if it is considered that the evidence justifying the short form review is not apparent. The Welsh Government will also be formally responding to the Delivery Agreements and will alert the authority if it considers the type of review to be of a high risk to the authority.

Q3. Where an authority is proposing to make partial revisions to an adopted LDP and the plan strategy remains sound, do you agree with the provision of the short-form revision procedure (quicker, shorter and more proportionate)?

Question 3	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	42	0	7	5
Business	5	0	0	0
LPA	21	0	1	0
Govt Agency/Other PS	5	0	2	1
Professional Body/Interest Group	8	0	1	1
Voluntary Sector	1	0	2	2
Other	2	0	1	1
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

There was strong support for the short form procedure with 78% supporting and no one disagreeing with the proposal.

Overview

There was strong support for this proposal with 78% of respondents considering that it would improve the system although again concerns were raised in relation to the element of risk in choosing the wrong form of revision. One response from the business community also considered that there should

be an opportunity to challenge a decision before the statutory consultation stages for the LDP.

Some of the local authorities considered that the time periods seemed ambitious and extremely tight for a short form revision - considering the availability of stakeholders and engagement with communities. Some local authorities considered the timescale of between 1-1.5 years seemed unrealistic if all of the plan preparation stages (including associated consultation commitments) have to be undertaken. Some local planning authorities also felt that greater clarity is required regarding the timescales for a short form review, referred to in the regulations as 12 months, as it is impossible for a Local Authority to produce a delivery agreement until it is known which type of review is being undertaken which is determined by the review report.

Further guidance was also sought on:

- when a short form revision should be undertaken. As a suggestion, a partial review could be a review of the policies and/or allocations set out in a plan that does not require a material change to the plan strategy;
- appropriate stakeholders – who these might be?
- the type and degree of evidence required to accompany the review report;
- clarification is required on what exactly “quicker, shorter and more proportionate” means. In particular, how the public, and defined communities of interest and community and town councils can, and should, engage in the revision procedure
- ‘substantial revision’ - what is meant by this term?
- clarity needed on steps to be taken in relation to how candidate site consultation are taken into account;
- clarification required on implications for SA and HRA procedures;
- consultation requirements on the Review Report;
- inspector’s ability to question any aspect of the plan in a short review

Two authorities considered that there should be an opportunity to be able to make minor changes without having to go through an expensive procedure to change minor wording. One authority suggested a third option to overcome this problem.

A voluntary organisation wanted reassurance that local communities would still be involved in the early engagement but also stated that this front loading engagement needed to be improved.

Some local planning authorities considered that TAN1 revision will create problems for the review process as it would trigger a plan review, which may prompt a revision when one is not necessary. They considered the changes to TAN1 would make it very difficult to prove otherwise.

It was also considered that some of the terminology used by the Welsh Government needed attention e.g. full review, it was suggested that it be replaced by “replacement plan” or “partial review”. Some LPAs appear to be under the impression that a short form review process would fit in between the four yearly statutory reviews, whilst others interpreted differently.

Welsh Government Response

Welsh Government will proceed with the legislative requirements to allow for short-form reviews. Further amendments have been made to the LDP Manual to ensure clarity on the issues raised above.

The Welsh Government does not consider a third option to change minor issues necessary as this could introduce less clarity and further ambiguity to the process.

Q4. Do you agree with the proposed package of soundness tests?

Question 4	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	29	6	13	5
Business	3	1	1	0
LPA	12	4	4	2
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	0	4	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	6	1	2	1
Voluntary Sector	1	0	2	2
Other	3	0	0	1
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

54% agreed with the soundness tests and 11% disagreeing with them. However those supporting the package did raise some concerns.

Overview

There was a mixed response to this question with some respondents expressing the view that the tests were clearer and that the supplementary

questions provided further guidance whilst others considered the new tests introduced less clarity and were vague.

Concerns were raised by several local planning authorities and one from the business community in relation to the wording of the questions – it was considered that they were open ended e.g. “are the vision and the strategy positive and sufficiently aspirational?” It was considered that such vagueness could be interpreted in several ways. It was considered by one from the business community that more detailed guidance is required to explain under what circumstances a plan would be considered unsound as per the revised tests. Others from the voluntary sector sought reassurance that engagement remained an important aspect of the tests. Clarification was sought on whether respondents would be expected to prepare their response in relation to the tests, the voluntary sector considered this was not necessary but the sub-questions were helpful to explain what kind of issues would be considered under each test.

One from the business community considered that for clarity National Policy should include relevant National Policy Statements under The Planning Act 2008.

For those who disagreed, they considered that the tests should be practical and not based upon matters which are not easily understood and by making them easier to understand had led to ambiguity. One from the business community felt that the soundness tests, as a concept, were woolly and not conducive to creating the best plan.

Welsh Government Response

The Welsh Government will proceed with the tests as they were in the consultation subject to minor amendments. The purpose of the sub-questions listed in the soundness tests is to provide an idea of what the soundness test will explore, it is not expected that each question should be answered. The guidance does not advise that representors need to apply the tests to their formal consultation response.

Q5. a. Do you agree that an integrated approach to incorporating sustainability appraisal (including strategic environmental appraisal) fully into LDP preparation will produce savings and reduce complexity?

Question 5a	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	25	2	20	7
Business	2	0	2	1
LPA	13	1	6	2
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	1	3	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	3	0	6	1

Voluntary Sector	3	0	0	2
Other	0	0	3	1
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

Over half of the respondents agreed to the integrated approach with only two disagreeing (3%). It was apparent in the responses, that some respondents had misunderstood the context of the question - some had thought that this referred to integrating SEA into the SA, not integrating both processes into the preparation of the LDP.

Overview

Some authorities confirmed that they had already taken this approach and that opportunities to streamline the process are welcomed however other local planning authorities (3) questioned whether this would result in less complexity. It was recognised that there were specific requirements for the SEA process and that these need to be adhered to. One LPA commented on the term “integration” suggesting that it can imply that they are combined and prepared together, rather than as two distinct pieces of work.

Another comment was made on the overall purpose of the using SEA/SA in the LDP process – it is to realise a more sustainable policy framework than would originally have been produced. This means that the SEA/SA has a direct impact upon the LDP by making changes to the LDP content. A key instrument in the LDP process is, therefore, a statement of how the SEA/SA has impacted on the LDP, identifying where changes have been made as a result of the SEA/SA. This statement also has the benefit of providing an audit trail for changes made through the assessment process of the SEA/SA. Consideration should be given to a requirement to include such a statement in the Deposit Version of plans.

In addition to the integrated approach, one recommended that a ‘Health in All Policies’ (HiAP) approach was adopted to ensure that health and wellbeing issues were considered during LDP preparation. It was considered that explicit reference to HIA being undertaken as part of Sustainability Appraisal would strengthen this, further promote an integrated approach and provide consistency with other Welsh Government legislation and policies.

Further guidance about what this means for site proponents was also considered necessary especially with frontloading the call for sites at the start of the process. It was suggested that the manual could provide a good practice example of how this is intended to be done to provide a steer for LPA’s and to avoid them having to reinvent the wheel. It went on to suggest that it would also be useful if the manual could provide an example of how site proponents are expected to address this to ensure consistency and transparency in the process across Wales which would help with making the process more user friendly for stakeholders, particularly those who may not have expertise or knowledge of the system.

Several authorities raised concerns with the implications of the work leading up to the first statutory stages and some questioned whether a fully integrated SA process could be effectively managed by an external consultant, and that local planning authorities would need to ensure that the skills were available in house to ensure that the process was truly integrated in order to be a fully flexible, adaptable and iterative process. However the authority pointed out that in their experience they have found that integrated SA had increased the sense of ownership of the SA process across the LDP team.

The main concerns raised by the two who disagreed with the integrated approach were in relation to specific detail of the wording contained in the Manual and that the integration may lengthen the process at the earlier stages of the plan and that this would need to be recognised in the delivery agreement.

Welsh Government Response

Welsh Government intends to proceed with the integrated approach as there was no overriding objection to the integration. Further amendments have been made to the LDP Manual for clarification and to ensure the issues raised by the government agency in relation to accuracy have been taken on board. The Welsh Government does not consider it necessary to lengthen the time to prepare the LDP by integrating the processes. Welsh Government already encourages authorities to clarify how evidence has influenced the content of the plan, and this includes the SA.

Q5b. Do you agree that this integration would not conflict with any statutory process?				
Question 5b	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	22	4	21	7

Question 5b	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
Business	1	0	2	2
LPA	11	3	6	2
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	1	3	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	3	0	6	1
Voluntary Sector	3	0	1	1
Other	0	0	3	1
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

41% of the respondents agreed that there would be no conflict and there was a very high percentage (39%) who neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

Overview

Some of the respondents wanted reassurance that the WG was happy that the procedural requirements of the regulations will be met through their new process.

Concerns were raised by a government agency in relation to the SEA element of the guidance in relation to references to European legislation. The SEA should have specific statutory stages which should be clearly defined in the guidance. It also suggested detailed comments on specific amendments to PPW and LDP Manual, to accommodate the content of the regulations accurately.

Welsh Government Response

The Manual and PPW have been amended to accommodate suggested corrections. The WG is content that the advice contained in the LDP Manual will now adequately explain the requirements included in the various legislation and how these should be taken into account when preparing the LDP.

Q6. In the LDP Regulations, do you agree with adding 'resources' as a matter to which regard must be had at Regulation 13, given that LDP strategies should be deliverable within the plan period?

Question 6	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	24	2	18	10
Business	4	0	0	1
LPA	8	2	10	2
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	0	3	1
Professional Body/Interest Group	3	0	5	2
Voluntary Sector	2	0	0	3
Other	3	0	0	1

Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

44% agreed with adding resources as a matter to which regard must be had at regulation 13.

Overview

Of those who supported this proposal further clarification was required on the meaning of 'resources'. Did this only cover the staff resourcing and budget to produce a plan or did it include the information about the relevant resources to deliver the plan's strategy?

Welsh Government Response

Welsh Government will not proceed with adding 'Resources' to the matters that LPAs must have regards to in the plan preparation. Welsh Government received further legal advice and as this is already a requirement in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, there would be no need to replicate it in the regulations. The LDP Manual has been revised to clarify the meaning of the term.

Q7. In the LDP Regulations, do you agree with adding the end date of the LDP period (i.e. the end of the period for which the LDP is planning) to the LDP sub-title at Regulation 11(1)(b)?

Question 7	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	32	4	15	3
Business	4	0	0	1
LPA	14	3	5	0
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	0	4	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	6	1	3	0
Voluntary Sector	2	0	1	2
Other	2	0	2	0
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

There was strong support for this especially from the business sector with 59% of all sectors agreeing supporting end dates for the LDP period.

Overview

It was recognised that an end date would act as deterrent to LPAs to allow their LDPs to become out of date and would make it clear to all users what period the plan covered. Many of the respondents concluded that an end date to the LDP period should be unnecessary provided that LDPs are adequately reviewed and revised with the plan period continually looking forward 10-15 years.

One of the professional bodies advocated that PPW made it clear, that in those circumstances where a Plan passes its end date and has not been revised in part or replaced in its entirety by a more up to date Plan, any subsequent decisions regarding the merits of development proposals are taken in the light of the most recent Welsh Government planning guidance or advice.

Further clarification was sought on the weight that should be given to the evidence supporting the plans.

Welsh Government Response

Welsh Government will proceed with adding the end date in the LDPs sub-title as it considers that the end date will be an incentive for local planning authorities to ensure that LDPs are reviewed regularly and will provide clarity to all users without having to search for end dates in the text of the written statements.

Q8. In the LDP Regulations, do you agree with removing the requirement to give notice by local advertisement (e.g. at Reg22(5)(b); Reg23(1)(c); 24(2)(b); 25(2)(c); 26(b))?

Question 8	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	31	6	12	5
Business	2	0	2	1
LPA	21	1	0	0
Govt Agency/Other PS	1	2	5	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	6	3	1	0
Voluntary Sector	1	0	1	3
Other	0	0	3	1

Total Responses:				54
-------------------------	--	--	--	-----------

Statistical Review

57% of respondents agreed that local advertisements could be removed from regulations, with only 11% disagreeing.

Overview

There was support for this proposal as many from every sector considered that newspapers have less influence than other media forms by now, and would minimise costs in the process. One local planning authority said that there was very little evidence showing that the advertisements had much influence. However, it was also raised that if this did not occur that some of the population may not receive details via media networks or has access to the relevant technology. Many recognised that it does raise the importance of providing effective public engagement early in the process, as part of the ‘front loading’ approach, to ensure all relevant groups are included from the outset, and that is clearly identified in the DA.

One of the businesses considered that not all stages would need to be advertised but considered that the submission of the LDP for examination, notification of the independent examination and the Inspector appointed, and notification of the adoption or withdrawal of the LDP, are key to ensuring that all those with an interest in the LDP process are fully informed of the progress of the LDP and therefore considered that sufficient publicity of these important stages in the progression of the LDP should be retained. Others from the voluntary sector considered that the retention of this requirement was essential to ensure effective community engagement.

Welsh Government Response

The Welsh Government will proceed with the removal of this requirement in regulations but recognises that some local planning authorities may consider local advertisements necessary, and those authorities will still be able to place advertisements in the papers and this will be specified in their community involvement scheme, but it should not be a requirement for all local planning authorities.

Q9. Do you agree with the revised list of statutory consultees?

Question 9	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	33	3	8	10
Business	2	0	2	1

LPA	18	0	2	2
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	2	2	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	6	1	1	2
Voluntary Sector	1	0	0	4
Other	2	0	1	1
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

61% of the respondents agreed with the list of consultees, with the 5% suggesting adding various organisations.

Overview

Some confusion over which statutory list the question referred to as some of the responses raised issues which related to the list of consultees issued alongside the consultation.

Some corrections were provided to organisation which have changed their names and further organisations suggested as additions to the list.

Welsh Government Response

The Welsh Government has taken on board some additions and ensured that the list is up to date for example, Fields in Trust and Canal and River Trust.

Q10. Do you agree with the principle of having a succinct two-document guidance package that excludes the need for LDP Wales? (Please note that we will in due course be revising the public guide, Planning Your Community: A guide to Local Development Plans 2006, to reflect changes taken forward.)

Question 10	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	41	0	7	6
Business	3	0	1	1
LPA	22	0	0	0

Govt Agency/Other PS	5	0	3	0
Professional Body/Interest Group	8	0	1	1
Voluntary Sector	1	0	2	2
Other	2	0	0	2
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

76% agreed with integrating the documentation.

Overview

This was strongly encouraged by all who responded to the question, having less documentation meant less confusion. However some raised specific examples of where paragraphs had not been replicated in PPW.

Welsh Government Response

Welsh Government will proceed with merging both documents and Government has checked the paragraphs identified by the respondents and PPW has been amended where necessary.

Q11. Are there any factual errors in the revised LDP documentation?

Question 11	Yes	No	Neither	DNA
	12	10	16	15
Business	0	0	3	2
LPA	6	7	5	4
Govt Agency/Other PS	4	0	3	1
Professional Body/Interest Group	2	2	3	3
Voluntary Sector	0	0	1	4
Other	0	1	1	2
Total Responses:				54

Statistical Review

Not relevant

Overview

Suggestions were made to specific paragraphs in the revised PPW and LDP Manual.

Welsh Government Response

Further amendments have been made to PPW and LDP Manual.

Q12. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Statistical Review

Not relevant.

Overview

The responses to this question made specific references to paragraphs and raised several issues including:

- Advice in relation to AONBs those LDP policies should adopt and agreed common policy approach.
- Several considered that constraints maps should be referenced in guidance.
- There may be instances where authorities may wish to rely on outdated versions of Planning Policy Wales.
- Anticipate future growth following on from the plan period.
- Lack of resources to monitor the plan, LPAs should not be penalised for not having the resource to seek the monitoring information from external bodies.
- Site promoters should undertake and produce viability assessments as part of site submission.
- Provision of transitional provisions so that authorities at various stages can take advantage of the changes proposed to regulations.
- Many local planning authorities took the opportunity to raise their concerns again in relation to the changes to TAN1, and how this relates to the need to review plan unnecessarily.
- Further clarification required on sites not put forward at the call for candidate sites.
- The necessity for paper copies to be available seems to be a considerable waste of resources for the LPAs, couldn't these be made available on request.

- Local authorities and communities within the county should be able to overturn LDPs in part or in whole.
- Development plans should accord with principles in relation to local need and access to primary resources which go beyond urban services, to also include productive land, natural water supplies, waste processing and renewable energy and that LDPs should identify settlement support land for use to grow food, water, and energy.
- Changing the use classes order in relation to second homes.
- When PPW introduces new policies it should clearly state how LDPs should treat the new policy.

Welsh Government Response

Further amendments have been made to the LDP Manual and PPW where applicable. Transitional provisions will allow relevant authorities to take advantage of the amendments to regulations.

Annex A - Full List of Respondents by Category

	Businesses		Local Planning Authorities
1	Redrow Homes (South and North Wales) Ltd	1	Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council
2	Association of Convenience Stores	2	LDP Pathfinder Group
3	RWE Generation UK plc	3	Bridgend County Borough Council
4	Huw Evans Planning	4	Caerphilly County Borough Council
5	National Grid	5	Cardiff City Council
	Government Agency/Other Public Sector	6	Carmarthenshire County Council
1	One Voice Wales	7	Ceredigion County Council
2	Natural Resources Wales	8	Denbighshire County Council
3	The Coal Authority	9	Flintshire County Council
4	Network Rail (Property)	10	Gwynedd Council & Isle of Anglesey County Council
5	Penarth Town Council	11	Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council
6	Dinas Powys Community Council	12	Monmouthshire County Council
7	Public Health Wales (PHW)	13	Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
8	North and Mid Wales Association of Local Councils	14	Newport City Council
		15	Pembrokeshire County Council
	Professional Bodies / Interest Groups	16	Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council
1	Farmers Union of Wales	17	City & County of Swansea
2	Royal Town Planning Institute	18	Torfaen County Borough Council
3	Planning Officers Society Wales	19	Vale of Glamorgan Council
4	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA)	20	Wrexham County Borough Council
5	Bywyd Cymru	21	National Parks Wales
6	Institute of Historic Building Conservation	22	North Wales Planning Policy Officers Group
7	Home Builders Federation		
8	The Law Society		Voluntary Sector
9	Institution of Civil Engineers Wales Cymru	1	Cilgwyn
10	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales	2	Planning Aid Wales
	Other	3	World Animal Protection
1	Joan Bird (individual)	4	Wales Environment Link
2	Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water (DCWW)	5	Abergavenny and District Civic Society
3	CLA Cymru		
4	Canal & River Trust/Glandŵr Cymru		Number of respondents: 54

Annex B – Statistical Overview of all Responses

The table below provides an overview of all responses to the questionnaire. It is based on the tables in the section on Statistical Breakdown and Overview of the Responses to Each Question and gives a strategic outline of the overall responses to the consultation the plans refinement exercise and their relative support for the questions posed (this table does not include figures for those who did not respond to specific questions, therefore the totals will not add up to 54, hence no percentages are shown).

Consultation Question	Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree (NAD); Disagree	Business	LPA	Govt Agency/Other PS	Professional Body/Interest Group	Voluntary Sector	Other	Total
Q1. With the proposed greater front-loading of the process in terms of sites and a more defined and informative Preferred Strategy, do you agree that no-one would be disadvantaged by the elimination of the ‘alternative sites’ stage (Regulations 20 & 21)?	Agree	0	20	4	7	3	1	35
	NAD	3	1	3	1	2	3	13
	Disagree	2	1	0	2	0	0	5
Q2. Do you agree that the LPA should prepare and publish a Review Report to justify whether a full or partial plan revision is appropriate, and that this should form part of the package of required documents at pre-deposit, deposit and submission?	Agree	4	17	5	6	2	2	36
	NAD	0	3	3	4	0	1	11
	Disagree	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Q3. Where an authority is	Agree	5	21	5	8	1	2	42

Consultation Question	Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree (NAD); Disagree	Business	LPA	Govt Agency/Other PS	Professional Body/Interest Group	Voluntary Sector	Other	Total
proposing to make partial revisions to an adopted LDP and the plan strategy remains sound, do you agree with the provision of the short-form revision procedure (quicker, shorter and more proportionate)?	NAD	0	1	2	1	2	1	7
	Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q4. Do you agree with the proposed package of soundness tests?	Agree	3	12	4	6	1	3	29
	NAD	1	4	4	2	2	0	13
	Disagree	1	4	0	1	0	0	6
Q5. a. Do you agree that an integrated approach to incorporating sustainability appraisal (including strategic environmental appraisal) fully into LDP preparation will produce savings and reduce complexity?	Agree	2	13	4	3	3	0	25
	NAD	2	6	3	6	0	3	20
	Disagree	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Q5b. Do you agree that this integration would not conflict with any statutory process?	Agree	1	9	4	3	3	0	20
	NAD	2	6	3	6	0	3	20
	Disagree	0	3	1	0	0	0	4

Consultation Question	Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree (NAD); Disagree	Business	LPA	Govt Agency/Other PS	Professional Body/Interest Group	Voluntary Sector	Other	Total
Q6. In the LDP Regulations, do you agree with adding 'resources' as a matter to which regard must be had at Regulation 13, given that LDP strategies should be deliverable within the plan period?	Agree	4	8	4	3	2	3	24
	NAD	0	10	3	5	0	0	18
	Disagree	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Q7. In the LDP Regulations, do you agree with adding the end date of the LDP period (i.e. the end of the period for which the LDP is planning) to the LDP sub-title at Regulation 11(1)(b)?	Agree	4	14	4	6	2	2	32
	NAD	0	5	4	3	1	2	15
	Disagree	0	3	0	1	0	0	4
Q9. Do you agree with the revised list of statutory consultees?	Agree	2	18	4	6	1	2	33
	NAD	2	2	2	1	0	1	8
	Disagree	0	0	2	1	0	0	3

Consultation Question	Agree; Neither Agree Nor Disagree (NAD); Disagree	Business	LPA	Govt Agency/Other PS	Professional Body/Interest Group	Voluntary Sector	Other	Total
Q10. Do you agree with the principle of having a succinct two-document guidance package that excludes the need for LDP Wales? (Please note that we will in due course be revising the public guide, Planning Your Community: A guide to Local Development Plans 2006, to reflect changes taken forward.)	Agree	3	22	5	8	1	2	41
	NAD	1	0	3	1	2	0	7
	Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q11. Are there any factual errors in the revised LDP documentation?	Agree	0	6	4	2	0	0	12
	NAD	3	5	3	3	1	1	16
	Disagree	0	7	0	2	0	1	10
Q12. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.	Agree	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	NAD	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0