



Martina Dunne
Head of Park Direction
Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
Llanion Park
Pembroke Dock
Pembrokeshire
SA72 6DY

23 May 2018

Dear Martina,

Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority Local Development Plan (LDP) Deposit (Regulation 17) Consultation: Welsh Government Representation

Thank you for consulting the Welsh Government regarding the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority's Local Development Plan (LDP) Deposit documents. We acknowledge that the preparation of a LDP and the supporting evidence is a significant undertaking and recognise the amount of work your Authority has undertaken to date in moving the plan forward from the Preferred Strategy to the Deposit stage.

The Welsh Government is broadly supportive of the spatial strategy which seeks to locate development in line with a hierarchy, directing growth to the most sustainable locations, whilst also supporting rural areas.

Demonstrating delivery of the strategy will be essential. The development planning system in Wales is evidence led and demonstrating how a plan is shaped by the evidence is a key requirement of an LDP examination. **The Authority must ensure there is a robust evidence base to demonstrate delivery of the LDP strategy and components of housing land supply**, which at present have a number of inconsistencies. The demonstration of delivery and viability of all sites in the LDP is critical, in particular those sites that are integral to the delivery of the strategy and objectives.

Without prejudice to the Welsh Minister's powers to intervene later in the process and to the independent examination, the Welsh Government is committed to helping Local Planning Authorities throughout the LDP process. The Deposit LDP has been considered in accordance with the tests of soundness as set out in PPW and the LDP Manual. **Our representations are separated into three categories which are set out by topic area in some detail in the attached annex.**

Category A: Fundamental issues that are considered to present a significant degree of risk for the Authority if not addressed prior to submission stage, and may have implications for the plan's strategy:

- **None**

Category B: Matters where it appears that the deposit plan has not satisfactorily translated national policy down to the local level and there may be tensions within the plan, namely:

- **Delivery: Demonstrating a 5 Year Supply and Flexibility**
- **Affordable Housing Viability**

Category C: Whilst not considered to be fundamental to the soundness of the LDP, we consider there to be a lack of certainty or clarity on the following matters:

- **Site Delivery and Implementation**
- **Spatial Distribution of Housing**
- **Affordable Housing Target**
- **Gypsy and Travellers**
- **Renewable Energy**
- **Welsh Language Sensitive Areas**
- **Safeguarded Employment Sites**
- **Minerals**
- **Green Wedges**

It is for your Authority to ensure that the LDP is 'sound' and it will be for the Inspector to determine how the examination proceeds once submitted. You should consider how you could maximise the potential of your LDP being considered 'sound' through the examination process. Members of my team look forward to meeting with you and your team to discuss the matters arising from this response in August. If you have any queries in the mean time, then please do not hesitate to make contact.

Yours sincerely,



Mark Newey
Head of Plans Branch
Planning Directorate

Annex to Welsh Government Letter (23 May 2018) in response to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority's Deposit LDP 2015-2031

Category A	Objections under soundness tests; <u>fundamental issues</u> considered to present a significant degree of risk if not addressed prior to submission.
Category B	Objections under soundness tests; matters where it appears the Deposit Plan has not satisfactorily translated national policy to the local level or there are tensions within the plan.
Category C	Objections under soundness tests; whilst not considered being fundamental to the soundness of the LDP, there is a lack of certainty or clarity on the matters which can be usefully addressed.

Category B – Delivery: Demonstrating a 5 Year Supply and Flexibility

The plan must contain consistent and robust information to demonstrate delivery of the housing requirement. A number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the housing land supply (allocations, windfalls and commitments) have been identified raising concerns over the ability to maintain a 5 year housing land supply and the level of flexibility in the plan. The level of flexibility should be sufficient to deal with unforeseen circumstances, such as the timing and deliverability of sites in the plan. The following requires further justification and clarification:

Housing Provision/Flexibility – Policy 48 ‘Housing Allocations’ identifies 16 site allocations to deliver 525 units. Housing Background Paper (Appendix 2) states 374 units will be delivered, resulting in a numerical difference of 151 units. Implications for the level of flexibility in the plan also need to be explained. The Authority appears to have counted units beyond the plan period in the housing provision which is inappropriate.

Windfall allowance - The Authority needs to justify the ‘large windfall’ rate of 21p/a, including why a 40% discount has been applied in Tenby. The evidence is not clear in this respect and requires clarification. It is also unclear why some ‘de-allocated’ sites outside boundaries are included within the windfall rates. Sites outside settlement boundaries should not be included as windfall and should be removed.

5 Year Housing Land Supply - There are inaccuracies that require amendment:

- Housing land supply (Appendix 3) is mathematically incorrect as it totals the housing provision, not the requirement. The flexibility allowance is to allow for the non-delivery of sites, it will never be built out in its entirety. The land supply figures for the plan need to be recalculated to ensure a 5 year supply at adoption and throughout the plan period.
- The supporting housing trajectory graph is mathematically incorrect; it does not align with the housing provision of 1,150; the graph totals 1,056.
- Land bank sites – it is also unclear where sites with planning permission are factored into the phasing in Appendix 3 and the graph. The Authority should confirm there is no double counting with the windfall rates on this basis.

Table 7: Future growth areas - HA5 and HA11 should be allocated in totality and included within the settlement boundary to ensure comprehensive development occurs. Only units

considered to be built out within the plan period should be counted numerically towards the plan provision, consistent with other allocations. Have these sites been subject to an SA?

Category B – Policy 49 - Affordable Housing Viability

There are inconsistencies between the high level and site specific viability assessment which need clarification:

- The Affordable Housing Viability Study (AHVS) has not included the impact of 'sprinklers' at £3,100 per dwelling. Whilst there is an element of 'headroom' above benchmark land values (BLV); it is unclear if this is sufficient to absorb sprinkler costs. It is also unclear whether the site specific work has included these costs.
- For those sites where 'abnormals' have been identified and have not been tested by the Arcadis Land Implementation Study (LIS) focusing on a more detailed approach, clarity is required to ensure that the viability level set in policy can be delivered.

Category C – Site Delivery and Implementation

Infrastructure requirements, associated costs, together with timescales for delivery from the Land Implementation Study (LIS) and Housing Background Paper should be included within the plan, or appendix, to aid the implementation and monitoring of the plan.

Category C – Spatial Distribution of Housing

Only 205 units (18% of total housing provision) are estimated to be delivered in Tenby, solely through commitments and windfall provision. The Authority should clarify why the potential sites identified in Tenby through the Settlement Capacity Study have not been taken forward as allocations; given it is the most sustainable settlement.

Category C – Policy 49: Clarify of Affordable Housing Target

The policy needs to identify the affordable housing target (250 – Policy 49 - or 273 – Table 6?) with specific targets for each sub area. In addition, to align with case law and PPW (paragraph 9.2.19) the policy must include an element of flexibility /viability and include reference to negotiation on a site by sites basis.

Category C – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) / Policy 51 Gypsy and Travellers

The GTAA states there is a need for 101 pitches across Pembrokeshire (2031) with an immediate need (by 2020) for 32 residential pitches and 2 Travelling Showpeople's yards. The Deposit Plan states "no need has been identified in the PCNP" (paragraph 4.301). This statement should be supported by a Statement of Common Ground with Pembrokeshire County Council and the Welsh Government's Equality and Prosperity Division in advance of the LDP examination.

Criterion a) is contrary to national policy. It implies Gypsies and Travellers have restricted freedom of movement to develop sites in other local authorities. This could be deemed as indirect discrimination under the Equality Act 2010 as Gypsies and Travellers are nomadic in nature and less likely to have a local connection to any particular local authority.

Category C – Policy 34: Renewable Energy

Policy 34 should be amended to refer to the different scales of renewable energy development (PPW, Figure 12.2) and make clear how the Authority would determine applications for each scale, in line with national policy (PPW, paragraph 12.8.14) and the Authority's Renewable Energy Assessment (REA). The target contribution of 49GWh should be included in the reasoned justification and reflected in the monitoring framework.

Category C – Policy 14: Welsh Language Sensitive Areas (WLSAs)

WLSAs for Community and Town Councils with 19.2% or more Welsh speaking population (paragraph 4.80, LDP) are shown on the Proposals Map; however, they should be listed in Policy 14. It is currently unclear to which settlements the policy would apply.

Category C – Policy 44 & 45: Safeguarding and Reuse of Employment Sites

Policy 44 criteria (e) and 45 conflate the issue of safeguarding employment land/premises. It should be clear as to which spatial locations the plan is seeking to retain employment uses and where, in appropriate circumstances, alternative uses may be acceptable.

Category C – Minerals

The Authority will need to demonstrate how a shortfall of 3.25mt of sand and gravel will be provided across the region. A 'Statement of Common Ground' should be produced and signed by all participating authorities to ensure the shortfall has been addressed.

Category C – Policy 17: Green Wedges

The number and scale of green wedges (41 in total) is excessive, especially in the context of a National Park. The evidence base does not adequately explain or justify in many cases how green wedges have been designated in line with PPW (para 4.8.3, 4.8.11).
