

Amgylchedd a Datblygu Cynaliadwy
Environment and Sustainable Development



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Mr Peter Morris
The LDP Team
Powys County Council
Neuadd Brycheiniog
Cambrian Way
Brecon
Powys
LD3 7HR

30.4.2012

Your ref: PS/LDP/PS2012
Our ref: PP030-02-019

RE: POWYS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2011-2026): PREFERRED STRATEGY REGULATION 15 CONSULTATION, WELSH GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Dear Mr Morris,

Thank you for consulting the Welsh Government regarding Powys Local Development Plan pre-deposit documents. We are pleased to see progress being made in furthering a development plan for the area.

It is for the statutory consultation bodies and their equivalents to contribute to Sustainability Appraisal (SA) including Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment exercises and your expert group to help you assess if they are fit for purpose. We recommend you obtain legal advice to ensure that you have met all the procedural requirements, including screening for SEA as responsibility for these matters rests with your Council.

In the past our comments at UDP pre-deposit draft stage would have been in the form of specific objections to policy omission, relevance or wording which, if not addressed at deposit or pre-inquiry changes, would be considered by the Inspector in arriving at the recommendations in the Inspector's Report.

Under the new system, the responsibility rests with the local planning authority to ensure that a submitted LDP is sound in procedural terms, and enshrines the principles of early community engagement, transparency, consistency, coherence and compatibility to neighbouring authorities. If these principles have not been addressed adequately at the earliest stages of preparation, then the deposit LDP may be considered unsound and unfit for examination. It

is essential that your deposit plan includes strong well-worded policies. guidance is included in LDP Wales and the Manual on policy wording.

Without prejudice to the Minister's discretion to intervene later in the process and to the independent examination, the Welsh Government is committed to helping local planning authorities minimise the risk of submitting unsound documents by making appropriate comments at the earliest stages of document preparation, and particularly at the Regulation 15 pre-deposit consultation stage. To do this, the Welsh Government looks for clear evidence that the ten tests of soundness (as set out in 'LDP Wales' and the 'LDP Manual', and explained further in guidance issued by the Planning Inspectorate) are being addressed.

(Please note that there will be a need to obtain and consider advice and representations from other relevant Government Divisions regarding candidate site proposals or aspects of detailed site assessment.)

Having considered all the submitted documents provided by Powys County Council under Regulation 15, we acknowledge the amount of work undertaken by the authority to reach this stage. To ensure your authority secures a sound plan in due course, we have provided a strategic assessment of the Preferred Strategy document (as supported by the other documentation you have provided). We have indicated where evidence of soundness is not immediately clear. The annex to this letter sets out the detailed comments of the Welsh Government on the Preferred Strategy document; some comments relate to more than one test of soundness and we have provided cross-references where most appropriate.

There still remain some substantive matters as outlined below, which need to be addressed well before you produce a deposit plan. We suggest that to support your on-going self-assessment regarding soundness, you ensure that:

- the proposals and policies included in the deposit plan respond to the **issues/ objectives** identified.
- the key issues are rationalised to show those the plan can actually seek to address and the objectives are refined, in particular in the light of the SEA.
- it is clear how the objectives are addressed by the strategy.
- the **vision** is supplemented to make it more locally distinct.
- emerging **evidence** informs the deposit plan.
- you demonstrate how **national policy** issues (such as affordable housing, flooding, climate change, infrastructure availability, environmental/landscape issues, waste, etc), have influenced development of the Preferred Strategy.
- the strategy indicates the level of proposed development in the main settlements and rural area. The deposit plan must avoid encouraging **development in the open countryside** damaging the character of the rural landscape.
- any deviation from the Welsh Government's latest population and household projections is justified based on robust and up to date evidence. **We object to the low level of housing provision** and lack of current

justification for deviation from our 2008 based projections. This has implications for meeting needs, delivering on the issues/ objectives and the ability of the plan to respond to changing circumstances. **Such an approach will not maximise the provision of affordable housing.**

- there is a clear link between **housing and employment land** requirements ensuring that commitments and allocations relate to the proposed spatial strategy/settlement hierarchy.
- there is clarity as to how the preferred strategy was chosen and it can be demonstrated how the options have been **consistently assessed** against the plan's objectives and assessments such as the SA/SEA/HRA, Welsh Language Assessment, energy assessment, travel assessments etc. It needs to be transparent how the implications of significant constraints (e.g. flood risk), the availability of infrastructure (surplus capacity), neighbouring authorities plans etc have informed the strategy
- the plan response to the impacts of **climate change** with regard to; floodplain /water management, biodiversity, green/open spaces and the historic environment, spatial distribution and design of new developments is appropriate.
- **infrastructure** necessary to support development is integral to the plan and articulated accordingly. This should, in broad terms, have regard to the scale, location, timing and funding of infrastructure to demonstrate sufficient certainty of delivery over the plan period.
- the strategy is **flexible** enough to respond to circumstances such as emerging regional work and evolving national/regional population/housing projections and justification for the **contingency** percentage is included.
- **strategic policies** in the deposit plan provide greater detail and clarity, being well aligned to the objectives and chosen strategy with supporting justification to indicate **delivery mechanisms** and **timescales for implementation**. The plan should not repeat national policy although cross- references are useful.
- an effective **monitoring framework is** developed.

You should document your response to our comments in your Consultation Report.

To assist your authority in taking forward the LDP, we recommend that we meet your officers to discuss our response. If you have any queries in relation to the response, please contact me (on 029 2082 3732).

Yours sincerely

Mark Newey
Head of Plans Branch
Planning Division
Welsh Government

Annex



Annex

Powys Local Development Plan Regulation 15: Welsh Government's response (annex to letter April 2012)

P1 - Prepared in accordance with the Delivery Agreement including the CIS	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
<p>We acknowledge that the Preferred Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the Delivery Agreement originally agreed by the Welsh Government (2 November 2010) (included a 3-month tolerance).</p> <p>The plan should be prepared in accordance with the CIS involving stakeholder and specialist groups.</p>	N/A
P2 - Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal including Strategic Environmental Assessment (and Habitats Directive Appropriate Assessment)	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
<p>SA/SEA and Habitats Appropriate Assessment - Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA): We note that the Preferred Strategy has been subject to an interim SA/SEA and subject to HRA screening.</p> <p>However it is not clear in the strategy document what impact these assessments have had on refining the plan objectives or the strategy as part of an on-going, iterative process.</p>	N/A

	Refine objectives, strategy and policies to reflect assessments and document the process.
--	---

C1 It is a land use plan which has regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or to adjoining areas.	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
<p>We note that the background documents supporting the preferred strategy aims to provide the national, regional and local context for the LDP and refers to a number of the key relevant plans, policies and strategies.</p> <p>However they are not summarised to bring out the key implications for the plan, nor is it made sufficiently transparent how they have influenced the strategy.</p> <p>Neighbouring Authorities It should be made clear when, where and how the plans of neighbouring authorities will impact on Powys and how this has been reflected in the preferred strategy. To ensure a robust evidence base especially in respect of the more peripheral settlements not in the growth corridor and where proposed limits could have cross boundary implications it is important the authority engages in documented collaborative working and obtains agreement: for example on housing, infrastructure; utilities, employment and retailing.</p>	<p>Demonstrate how other relevant plans and strategies have influenced the contents of the plan..</p> <p>Ensure evidence is provided on areas of joint working identified both within the authority and external organisations.</p>

C2 It has regard to national policy.	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
<p>LDP Wales and PPW make it clear that though LDPs must have regard to national policies, they should not repeat them, but rather explain how they apply to the local area. There is little reference to the use of national policy in the strategic policy section despite considerable overlap. It should be made clear</p>	<p>Review, refine or supplement the strategy and deposit plan proposals to reflect national policy where</p>

where national policy will apply/suffice and where more local interpretation/application is intended.

The Figures at the end of each chapter of PPW provide a guide to the application of national policy to LDPs which should inform the deposit plan. The following are some examples of where there is a particular need to have regard to national policy but the list is not intended to be comprehensive.

N.B. Further comments in relation to national policy are also included under soundness tests CE1 & CE2

Population projections and apportionment. See **objection** and comments below in respect of growth options.

Affordable housing target 'Planning Policy Wales' requires local planning authorities to make appropriate provision for affordable housing (paragraph 9.1.2). Increased provision of affordable housing is a key policy goal for the Welsh Government. Where there is identified need the plan should seek to maximise provision commensurate with viability. National policy requires affordable housing exception sites to be 100% affordable housing (paras 7.3.10/16 suggest otherwise)

Gypsy and Traveller provision: The requirements of WG Circular 30/2007: 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites' and Annex B should be followed.

It is noted that the Authority is depending on a current permission within the National Park, however it needs to be clear whether this site will be delivered, whether it will accommodate the whole need and what contingency provision is being made.

appropriate.

See also comments under soundness tests CE1 & CE2

The deposit plan should adopt a form of notation that makes clear when national policy will apply.

Any deviation from our latest population and household projections will need to be robust and fully justified.

Include target and policies backed by robust evidence of need and viability to maximise delivery. This should include appropriate thresholds, commuted sums and exception policies.

The plan must meet the level of need identified through the evidence.

Where necessary specific sites should be allocated in the deposit plan (both permanent and transit) to meet the level of need along with an appropriate criteria based policy. Any reliance on provision by a neighbouring authority must be in agreement with that authority.

Minerals: 'Minerals Planning Policy Wales' and MTANs set the framework for LDPs to work within. This includes safeguarding mineral resources, areas for working to provide for needs or where working would be inappropriate, application of buffer zones, prohibition orders and provision of local materials for vernacular buildings. NB minerals safeguarding will need to be included in the plan based on BGS Mineral Resource Maps in 2010 and Aggregate Safeguarding Maps. These maps do not form part of national policy but are signposted as a consistent and readily available set of information for safeguarding in LDPs.

Waste: National Planning Policy Clarification Note (CL-04-04) '*Unitary Development Plans – Waste Policies Hazardous Waste Planning Applications*' (May 2004) sets out the minimum guidance to future waste management development that the Welsh Government is likely to find acceptable in development plans. LDPs should reflect the Regional Waste Plan and include an analysis or commentary about how it relates specifically to the current context for waste management and waste planning in the plan area. Plans should identify sufficient sites to provide for a range of facilities in order to meet European Directives.

The deposit plan should:

- adequately safeguard mineral resources in line with national policy and maintain consistency across boundaries with neighbouring LPAs;
- adequately provide for the contribution to aggregates production over the plan period identified in the RTS;
- be as clear as possible as to areas where coal should not be worked;
- include Buffer Zone and dormant site requirements;
- clarification on serving prohibition orders;
- be supported by robust background evidence.
- ensure clear evidence is provided on how mineral supply and safeguarding has affected the development of the preferred strategy.

The deposit plan be supported by evidence and should make appropriate site allocations for local and regional waste requirements and include a related 'B2' employment policy to provide flexibility. This will

<p>Water supply and waste water infrastructure: Plans/plan allocations must be deliverable. Evidence regarding the capacity of waste water infrastructure and water supply is limited so far and could raise questions regarding the deliverability of sites in certain locations.</p> <p>Flood risk: 'Planning Policy Wales' paragraph 13.2.3 and TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk. It is not clear yet whether flood risk issues have been given a sufficient weight in terms of developing the preferred strategy, or will be in terms of allocating specific sites.</p> <p>Climate change and renewable energy. Regard should be had to PPW, Tan 8, the Renewable Energy Toolkit and related clarification letters.</p>	<p>require expression in terms of land area (hectares) as well as site identification.</p> <p>Ensure capacity is available or that it can be delivered in areas selected for development.</p> <p>Complete and reflect SFCA and other assessments. Provide clear evidence of how flood risk has been reflected in the development of the preferred strategy and strategic site selection.</p> <p>Understand the impacts of climate change and the adaptation responses with regard to; floodplain / / water management, biodiversity, green/open spaces and the historic environment in the location and design of new developments.</p> <p>Provide clear evidence of how climate change (including flood risk) has been taken into account and affected the development of the preferred strategy Clarify how renewable energy resources will be promoted through the preferred strategy (it is noted that</p>
--	--

	renewable energy policy is being developed)
--	---

C3 It has regard to the Wales Spatial Plan	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
There is reference to the WSP (par 2.11.2) but there is no explanation why the hub and cluster settlement hierarchy it sets out is not employed as an option nor whether the status suggested for Newtown is appropriate or not.	Clarify.

C4 - Has regard to the relevant community strategy/ies.	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
There is some limited reference to 'One Powys' but key provisions are not recorded to help show how the plan responds.	Clarify.

CE1 The plan sets out coherent strategy from which its policies and allocations logically flow and/or, where cross boundary issues are relevant, it is compatible with the development plans prepared by neighbouring authorities & CE2 The strategy, policies and allocations are realistic and appropriate having considered the relevant alternatives, and/or are founded on a robust and credible evidence base	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
Document structure and presentation <i>The Preferred Strategy documentation should make clear what the key issues are that the LDP will address, what the plan vision is, what the plan objectives are, what strategic spatial options were considered and what the preferred spatial strategy is (see LDP Manual section 6.5).</i>	

General

The documentation (section 7) does not yet bring together the preferred strategy elements into a final comprehensive text for the first part of the LDP. This will require careful drafting for the deposit plan to provide the succinct justifications and linkages that will demonstrate how the strategy is appropriate, coherent and deliverable

Although key policies are linked to the objectives there will need to be a brief justification of them with links to the evidence base and background analysis papers.

Coherence (links) and flow: To keep the LDP focused a distilled version of the key land use planning messages arising from the review of other strategies and the portrait of the area will be needed in the deposit plan to show the origin of the key issues and how they flow through the strategy.

Connections between preferred topic approaches are not always made entirely clear and there could be some improvement in links so it is easier to understand how they make up a coherent strategy. For example how the separately generated employment and housing scenarios sit together. It is appreciated that there does not appear to be a need for more employment land than already available as commitments but there should be some explanation of population growth and structure relative to the analysis of employment land needs and if the current distribution is largely set then how this is seen to influence the distribution of further housing development to meet the 'need to travel' objective. There are similar issues relating to the lack of need for increased retail provision and the implications of the current distribution of supermarkets for any strategy seeking to minimise the need to travel.

Realistic and Appropriate: Comments made under other soundness tests are also relevant here. There are a number of areas where the options/preferred options do not appear realistic/appropriate or there is insufficient justification. The following are examples:-

- Considering the UDP figure for employment land requirements as a potential option rather than just the status quo/business as usual position.
- Preferring a low housing growth option - see below
- The rationale for the preferred hybrid spatial option

Bring together the preferred strategy elements into a comprehensive text providing succinct justifications and linkages.

Include cross-references to refer to specific paragraphs/ pages of the evidence base where possible, this would allow the plan to be concise as the bulk of the justification could be included in the background documents and only concise summaries included in the reasoned justification.

Review presentation and rationale. Provide sufficient justification.

<p>Sufficient Detail/Implications: To understand the implications of the strategy further strategic work will be required so that the basis for growth distributions between the proposed growth corridor and specific settlements in the hierarchy is clear and the scale of development in each is apparent. The extent to which the eventual distribution is the result of the application of a coherent strategy for service centre support and/or is a response to appropriate opportunities or commitments will need to be explained.</p>	<p>Present relevant details and justification in a clear and transparent manner.</p>
<p>Evidence Base: Robust and Credible: A considerable amount of evidence is still emerging – the implications of this for the choice of strategy and the deposit plan content will need to be reviewed. While evidence should be available to inform choices at the outset not justify them afterwards provision should be made to regularly refresh key evidence (e.g. viability) and the strategy should be flexible enough to respond.</p> <p>Background documents have been prepared, at least in part, but should any fundamental aspects of the strategy change when the evidence is finalised/ reviewed, the Authority should make it clear where such changes occur in preparing the next stages of the plan.</p> <p>It will be important to ensure that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •the population/housing growth option is based on a statistical analysis and robust data which may vary during plan preparation, or if policy based there are very strong reasons for this which can be fully justified at examination. • the LHMA has influenced the level of growth and supports the strategy – particularly the implications on the respective needs for market and affordable housing. It appears c60% of the population cannot afford market housing. • the viability and delivery of affordable housing provision is demonstrated • any other obligations/CIL/S106 requirements can be delivered • the priority to be placed on S106 requirements in particular locations/circumstances is clear • the issue of infrastructure constraints and therefore solutions is fully detailed. • the retail studies remain up-to- date and reflect a range of growth options - including the one preferred. •the open space assessment meets current guidance. 	<p>Ensure the preferred strategy is sufficiently flexible to respond to changes in the economy, housing market assessment, strategic site take up and other changes.</p> <p>Ensure that the background documents contain more than facts and figures, these should include analysis/explanation/ justification of how the authority has reached its deposit plan which can be cross-referenced to short summaries in the deposit plan.</p>

<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance should not contain policy but where the plan relies on such guidance to indicate how policies will be applied in practice it should be made available at the same time as the plan or shortly afterwards in line with a timetable.</p>	<p>Information on the SPG programme should be provided when the plan goes on deposit, including timescales for its preparation. SPG adopted under the UDP should be reviewed or updated to ensure that it is in line with the preferred strategy of the LDP.</p>
<p>Vision and Objectives. <i>An LDP vision should be locally distinctive, land-use orientated, place specific and clearly identify actions that will have occurred over the period to ensure issues have been addressed</i></p> <p>The vision could be more locally specific so it provides a clearer picture of where the authority wants to be in land use planning terms, the changes envisaged on the ground, the form and function places will take, how communities will look by the end of the plan period and where the majority of development will take place. It would be beneficial to adopt a structure that reflects that adopted for the issues, objectives and strategy to demonstrate linkages.</p> <p>The objectives are similarly non-specific in terms of location and could have been more focused to help deliver the vision. They should be refined in the light of the SA/SEA process and need to be better framed as objectives in some cases. Tighter clear SMART objectives which include details of the actions that need to be taken to achieve the vision (and timescales if appropriate) will make them easier to monitor and also help ensure the strategy is being delivered.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand what role the plan objectives have played in selecting the preferred options. Although it is accepted that objectives relevant to the key policies are identified it is not entirely clear how the spatial strategy achieves the plan's objectives.</p>	<p>Supplement the vision to make it more locally distinct by expanding on how it will be delivered through the plan and how it relates to the LDP objectives.</p>

Strategic Options

Options should be chosen from a limited range of realistic alternatives which can be supported by robust evidence. Some of the options examined are dismissed easily which questions whether they are realistic and in other cases, some do not appear to be supported by the evidence.

It would be helpful to identify the status quo/current policy position separately for comparative purposes so that the intended direction of travel is clear.

It is not entirely clear how the final choice of preferred strategy was derived from the options identified. It would be more transparent if the assessment of the options could be summarised against a more structured framework of criteria including compatibility or otherwise with the plan objectives, the SA/SEA, the WSP, the Welsh language and other assessments, etc.

Spatial Options

See ref to WSP option.

The evolution of the preferred 'hybrid' option and its superiority when tested against a common assessment framework must be made clear. The conclusions so far appear weak.

The operational relationship of public transport (currently based on a radial main centre patten?) to a linear growth corridor needs to be explained. The proposed 'left over' approach to identifying extra growth in the 'corridor' suggests a lack of commitment to the concept. The impact on neighbouring areas, of restricting development in peripheral settlements, need to be considered further with the affected authorities.

It should be made clear how the availability of infrastructure (surplus capacity), schools policy any significant overriding constraints (e.g. flood risk) and the current distribution of commitments has influenced the options for, and choice of the, preferred spatial strategy.

It is not clear to date what the precise distribution of development between the main settlement hierarchy tiers will be and the justification for this. Equally the extent of development proposed in the smaller tier settlements will need to be established and justified while the way in which it will be distributed and properly controlled will need to be clear at this level to avoid any distortion of the strategy in practice..

Ensure adequate clarity on how the options selected are realistic options for meeting the plan's objectives.

Ensure that the selection of the preferred **spatial option** is founded on robust evidence, and that the role of stakeholders in developing it is appropriate; and that it is clear in how it will achieve the plans objectives.

Provide more clarity on why the UDP strategy is no longer appropriate for the LDP.

A detailed review of **settlements** must ensure the strategy is robustly evidenced and establish the level of growth that can be accommodated at each tier, based on role and function. The capacity for development within settlements needs to be evidenced and clarified in the Deposit Plan. Distribution/control mechanisms need to be clear and workable in practice.

Growth Options

It should be possible to support all options explored with robust evidence. The justification for the growth levels included as options should be provided.

At least in the early stages of plan making growth options are better expressed as a range to provide the flexibility to respond to revised forecasts, etc. which may occur before submission.

It is not clear whether the strategy sufficiently addresses the issues of the need for, and provision of, affordable housing as highlighted in the key issues.

The plan sets out the growth options under different types of development – employment land growth/ retail growth/ housing growth. Although this approach is not inappropriate, the options under one type of development do not seem to have been linked to those under another. The options should clearly illustrate how they are inter-related. The various types of development include a different number of options which emphasises the lack of links between them. In particular the interaction between employment and housing provision could be better explained.

The supporting evidence for the options should be consistent for all types of development – it is difficult to understand why the authority considers the Welsh Government's 2008 projections too high for the housing growth but appropriate for retail and employment growth studies. Equally views on the likely hood of upturn/downturn in the market will need to be consistent (e.g. retail/ affordable viability).

Housing Growth:

Regard should be had to PPW paragraphs 9.2.2 and 9.2.1.

Five growth options have been considered in order to inform the strategy. Option E (zero migration) is not a real option and should only be included as background information along with an indication of a status quo policy approach.

Option C, the preferred option, is based on the WG 2008 lower variant household projection. This represents substantially fewer dwellings (2,100 dwellings or 23%) over the plan period relative to the principal projection. It is accepted that information from the 2011 census will begin to become available this year and will have to be addressed and reflected in the plan. The Welsh Government

Ensure all options are realistic and backed by robust evidence.

Ensure clear evidence is available to explain how growth level predictions have influenced the selection of the preferred strategy.

The deposit plan and its evidence base should clarify the inter-relationship between housing and employment land allocations within the plan area and with neighbouring plan areas

The deposit LDP should:

- provide robust housing figures which are adequately evidenced in accordance with national policy; where a plan deviates from the latest WG projections it is the responsibility of the LPA to justify the deviation, as set out in PPW
- include a robust affordable housing target;
- provide threshold(s) to deliver affordable housing and clarify the

consider there is insufficient evidence to justify the proposed level of growth set out in the preferred strategy.

The plan needs to provide sufficient headroom to be able to respond to upturns in the market and economic situation, what the industry could deliver in the future and the need to provide affordable housing, etc.

Consistency and clarity is required in the terminology used in the document. It is unclear whether the household projections have been converted to dwellings and what conversion rate has been used? Equally there is some confusion in respect of the terms completions, commitments, windfalls and small site provision.

A broad estimate of the likely delivery of windfall housing will be required and, where appropriate, should be incorporated as part of the housing provision in the deposit plan.

Employment growth:

Option 1: the UDP rate does not appear to be a real option just a status quo comparator. Option 3 based on the emerging economic needs study has been chosen as the preferred option but the realism of the projection relative to the very low rate of past take-up will need to be justified. Past over allocations, poorly located sites or ones which have never been progressed to any degree should be rationalised in the light of a rigorous review which should also explore the appropriateness of other uses. Linking good quality sites to the settlement hierarchy, growth corridor and housing provision is vital.

Retail Growth:

The retail study needs to be run for a range of population scenarios not just the 2008 projections to reflect growth options. It appears there is sufficient current floor space but it is not clear if this is uniformly distributed and is it reflected in the proposed policy. Is the impact of inter-net retailing reflected sufficiently and what does supermarket provision say about the existing settlement hierarchy

- reasons for them with suitable viability studies;
- evidence collaborative working with neighbouring LPAs in identifying housing requirements;
- clarify the inter-relationship between housing/ employment/ retail land allocations within the plan area and with neighbouring plan areas;
- clarify households/dwellings
- explain clearly how provision for windfall sites, rural exceptions site policy and any allocation of sites for 100% affordable housing is accommodated.

The deposit plan and its evidence base should:

- ensure the level of provision and distribution proposed can be fully justified
- identify any strategic employment sites;
- be robust and realistic in terms of employment land allocations and their deliverability;

Reflect the current lack of need, likely changes to retailing and the current distribution in the strategy/policies.

<p>and zones of influence?</p>	
<p>Strategic Policies <i>The draft strategic policies in the preferred strategy document should be the key delivery mechanisms for areas of change in the preferred spatial strategy (LDP Manual paragraph 6.5.1).</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments at section C2 and above in CE 1&2 above are relevant. 2. There is no/little reference to national policy and how this relates to LDP policy and yet there is a considerable overlap without an additional local dimension. 3. The Figures at the end of each chapter of PPW provide a guide to the application of national policy to LDPs which should inform what maybe appropriate in the deposit plan. 4. Further consideration will need to be given to expressing the policies in land use terms so that they can be used to manage/control development. (e.g. SP1) 5. In some cases the wording will need to be refined. 6. SP2 makes reference to flood risk and it is noted that further work on SFCA is proposed. It is important that the assessment/proposals in the deposit plan fully reflect PPW and Tan 15. 7. SP3 should distinguish 'international' sites where different, more stringent, criteria apply. 8. SP4 Maintaining a 5- year supply of housing land is national policy – if this is intended to imply a broad local phasing approach then it should be clearer. The need or otherwise for provision for Gypsy and Travellers should be fully evidenced and sites allocated in the deposit plan as appropriate. The strategic policies do not cover the principle of affordable housing / affordable target which is a key issue. 9. SP 5 has more land-use orientated phrasing in the initial part but the wording of criteria 2 and 3 needs revisiting. The policy may need to say more about the importance of strategic sites, other employment types and mixed use? 10. SP 6 seems to just repeat national policy. The policy does not address the evidence which appears to suggest there is no need for more retail development. If this is correct the policy will need to be far more locally distinct possibly identifying different uses, types of development and settlements separately. 11. SP 9. The impact of any proposed/anticipated development on the Welsh language (including where the plan relies on a proportion of windfalls) should be assessed when preparing the plan and reflected in the strategy. Further assessment at application stage should only be needed 	<p>Clarify where national policy will apply.</p> <p>Redraft strategic policies for greater relevance and local focus; add necessary detail from the emerging evidence base. Ensure the policies provide clear requirements to ensure the spatial strategy will be delivered.</p> <p>Actions at sections C2 and above in CE 1&2 are relevant</p> <p>Explain why a phasing policy to ensure a spread of development throughout the plan period is needed and how this will operate in practice.</p> <p>Provide greater explanation of the key transport / infrastructure required to deliver the Strategy and if this is the necessary the various funding/planning obligation mechanisms to be employed.</p>

<p>to cover totally unforeseen proposals or for detailed mitigation. In the latter case the principle of the development being acceptable should not be an issue at application stage.</p> <p>12. SP 11 Mineral safeguarding and mineral allocations for working will need to be shown on the proposals map; the plan needs to be as clear as possible as to areas where coal should not be worked in the plan period.</p> <p>13. SP 12 Waste policies and proposals should be based on evidence, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - why the sites have been chosen for the location of suitable waste facilities; and - the ability of the sites to accommodate site waste management facilities required to meet regional and local needs (e.g. suitability and availability). <p>Sites allocated for waste management in the LDP should be identified on the proposal map.</p> <p>Policies proposing any major new development should incorporate adequate and effective waste management facilities.</p> <p>14. Transport is not set out as a specific policy within the PS. This is surprising given the preferred spatial strategy is based on a 'growth corridor'. It would be beneficial to provide greater detail within the Deposit Plan noting the key transport infrastructure that will be required to meet the strategy, and the various funding/planning obligations mechanisms (if this is the case) in order to realise a corridor approach.</p> <p>15. We would welcome the opportunity to assist with the refinement and development of policy for the plan.</p>	
--	--

CE 3 There are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
<p>Implementation and Delivery</p> <p>The deliverability of the preferred option has not been addressed in the Preferred Strategy. When developing the deposit plan more consideration should be given to this matter, with clarification of what infrastructure is critical to delivery, how it will be delivered, including timescales for implementation. There is an indication flood risk and other key issues will need to be considered, however these have yet to be fully explored. As such they may prejudice the delivery of the 'growth corridor/settlement hierarchy' based strategy in certain areas. Impacts on the delivery of affordable housing should also be fully explored. CIL intentions and/or Section 106 priorities should be made clear.</p>	<p>Delivery is extremely important including timescales. Funding streams, key delivery agents, and infrastructure requirements will need to be identified at an early stage.</p> <p>This will result in a natural phasing</p>

<p>Monitoring</p> <p>A monitoring framework has not been included as part of the PS.</p> <p>A monitoring framework should consider the key indicators as noted in the LDP Manual along with other local indicators and should establish targets (along with directions of travel and milestones/phasing). Links need to be made to the issues/objectives and the policies together with principal implementation routes, responsibility for implementation (including stakeholder involvement), timescale, resource implications, etc. Contingencies and triggers for review should also be considered.</p>	<p>over the plan period, although a policy approach may also assist.</p> <p>A monitoring framework should include key targets/ranges, triggers and links to strategic objectives. Indicators should be locally distinctive and linked to the key issues.</p>
--	--

CE 4 It is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances	
<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Actions</u>
<p>The deposit LDP should be sufficiently flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances (such as a key site not coming forward for development), and identify any contingencies that might be in place, or what would trigger a review of the Plan.</p> <p>At present it is difficult to assess whether the PS is sufficiently flexible given that key elements of many policy areas have not yet been finalised.</p> <p>However it is noted that a 10% contingency rate is adopted for housing provision. While this is a reasonable rule of thumb in normal circumstances it will need to be justified locally and the need to respond either way to more up-to-date projections which will be available before deposit/examination.</p>	<p>Ensure the strategy and deposit plan is sufficiently flexible to respond to changes in the economy, housing market assessment, key site take up and other changes. Include a level of flexibility in the overall level of provision, clearly justifying the rationale for such flexibility.</p>

Detailed comments relating to evidence and analysis

- Section 2 Character of Powys: This just a summary of facts – it does not bring out implications for the plan or issues the plan needs to try to resolve.

- Paragraph 2.7.2 the paper does not explain the impact of the decrease in HH size on the dwelling requirement. There is reference to the Council's own projections – where are they?
- Paragraph 2.7.4 completion information must be considered in the context of land supply constraints at the time
- Paragraph 2.10 retail – internet impact – this is mentioned as an issue but not here?
- Paragraph 5.2 Employment land Growth:

The significant difference between take-up and the latest study findings will need to be justified. Further assessment of the location and quality of employment sites is required, in particular their locations relative to the proposed settlement hierarchy. There may be potential to de-allocate if not commenced/possibility of use for other purposes.

For the very small settlements the use of market housing as a tool to deliver affordable housing is explored but it is questionable to what degree the small scale developments involved would be viable with an affordable requirement, are these sustainable locations and is market housing appropriate?

The number of tiers of rural settlement appears confusing with little benefit. The way in which applications in these locations will be determined is unclear. How will the number of consents be controlled?