



**Cross- Boundary Settlements –
Consistency of approach with
Neighbouring Authorities
2021**

Development Plans
March 2021

Contents

Introduction	3
Relevant National Planning Policy and Guidance	3
Compatibility with Neighbouring Authorities Strategies	4
Pembrokeshire County Council and Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority Alignment.....	4
PCNP LDP2 approach to cross-boundary settlements	4
PCC LDP2 approach to cross-boundary settlements	5
The hierarchy position of settlements for LDP2 in PCNP and PCC	5
The hierarchy position of settlements for LDP2 in Carmarthenshire and PCC, and Ceredigion for LDP1	9
Conclusions	9

Pembrokeshire County Council (PCC) cross boundary settlements with neighbouring Local Planning Authorities (LPA)

Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this short report is to look at how settlements that fall both within Pembrokeshire County Council's (PCC's) planning jurisdiction and that of its neighbouring Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are considered in terms of each authority's settlement hierarchy policy and the degree of consistency between authorities. These are settlements which could be considered 'split' as part of the settlement falls in the jurisdiction of one Authority and part of the settlement falls in the jurisdiction of another Authority.
- 1.2 The review of the Pembrokeshire County Council Local Development Plan (adopted February 2013) commenced 5th May 2017. This background paper has been prepared as part of the evidence base of LDP 2.
- 1.3 This paper should be read in conjunction with the Council's Rural Facilities Report December 2020 and the Council's Defining Settlement Clusters Report Update December 2020.

Relevant National Planning Policy and Guidance

- 1.4 Planning Policy Wales Edition 11 notes that Planning Authorities should work in collaboration to plan our communities to deliver the best planning outcomes (page 44).
- 1.5 The Welsh Government Development Plans Manual (Edition 3) notes that in developing their spatial strategy the LPA should undertake a settlement assessment to inform decisions regarding where development should be spatially located to achieve a sustainable pattern of growth. The Manual states "*The assessment should not be confined to the geographical boundaries of its administrative boundary, but take account of the relationship settlements have with neighbouring areas,*" Paragraph 5.15
- 1.6 One of the tests of soundness for the Local Development Plan is "Does the Plan fit?" A key element of answering this question is considering the degree to which a Plan is compatible with the plans of neighbouring authorities. This paper forms a part of the evidence base for PCC in demonstrating the 'fit' of PCC's LDP 2 strategy with the LDP strategies of neighbouring Authorities.
- 1.7 Whilst PCC shares a border with three LPAs (Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, Ceredigion and Carmarthenshire), the primary focus of this paper will be to consider Pembrokeshire Coast National Park (PCNP), as PCC shares the greatest number of settlements with the authority. There are no settlements that are 'split'

between PCC and Ceredigion and only one settlement which is ‘split’ between PCC and Carmarthenshire.

Compatibility with Neighbouring Authorities Strategies

Pembrokeshire County Council and Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority Alignment

2.1 Before looking at individual settlements, we must first consider the spatial strategy for both planning authorities. This is set out in the below table.

PCC Tier Number and Name	PCNP Tier Number and Name
Tier 1: Main Town	Tier 1: N/A
Tier 2a: Rural Town	Tier 2: Local Service and Tourism Centre
Tier 2b: Service Centre	Tier 3: Local Centre
Tier 2c: Service Villages	Tier 4: Rural Centres
Tier 2d: Local Village (and Cluster Local Village)	N/A
Countryside	Tier 5: Countryside

2.2 PCNP tier numbers 1 to 3 are based on the Wales Spatial Plan (Pembrokeshire Haven, Key Settlement Framework 2021), with Tier 4 & 5 based on evidence of settlement facilities following analysis by PCNPA . PCC’s Tier 1 hierarchy was also informed by the Wales Spatial Plan, the Draft National Development Framework and the Urban Settlements Report undertaken by PCC. The latter analyses the functional characteristics and availability of services and facilities. Tier 2 is taken from the Rural Facilities Report 2019.

2.3 There is conformity between the two plans for the different levels of the hierarchy, with both basing the higher levels on the national framework provided by the Wales Spatial Plan and National Development Framework (now Future Wales). Both authorities have used analysis of facilities to inform identification of lower levels of their hierarchy.

2.4 Future Wales was finalised in 2021. The settlements identified within the document as Regional Growth Centres in Pembrokeshire reflect those included in the Draft National Development Framework.

PCNP LDP2 approach to cross-boundary settlements

2.5 For settlements predominantly in PCC’s planning jurisdiction which PCNPA recognise as settlements within their hierarchy, PCNPA has used PCC’s LDP1 settlement hierarchy position to define the position to ensure consistency of approach.

2.6 For settlements predominantly in PCNPA's planning jurisdiction, the Authority has set the position using their background paper 'Scale and Location of Growth Background Paper'. Settlements were analysed in terms of facilities available with rural centres having at least 3 facilities found in a small village.

PCC LDP2 approach to cross-boundary settlements

2.7 All settlements are considered using the rural facilities study, which takes account of services within PCC and PCNP area, and population estimates includes people living within PCNP where a settlement is identified the hierarchy. As PCNP does not have an equivalent to the Local Village tier, only the population within PCC area is considered in these locations.

2.8 As PCC Deposit LDP2 was created after PCNP Deposit LDP2, the background paper 'Rural Facilities 2019' was updated to reflect changes since LDP1, so some settlements predominantly within PCC's planning jurisdiction have changed position in the hierarchy, reflecting changes in service provision since PCC's LDP 1 was adopted. The Rural Facilities Report has been further updated in 2020 and this report should be read in conjunction with that update.

The hierarchy position of settlements for LDP2 in PCNP and PCC

2.9 The below table states the position at which each settlement sits within each Authority's settlement hierarchy and whether or not they have cross boundary conformity. The settlements are listed in accordance with their position in the PCC settlement hierarchy.

Settlement Name & Predominately PCC, PCNP or split?	PCC	PCNP	Cross-Boundary Conformity?
Crymych (PCC)	Service Centre	Local Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Lamphey (PCC)	Service Centre	Rural Centre	PCNP used PCC's Rural Facilities 2010 which stated the village was a Service Village. PCC upgraded the settlement to a Service Centre based on 2019 evidence. Whilst Lamphey has a higher status in PCC's LDP both hierarchy positions allow market housing to be developed.
Llangwm (PCC)	Service Centre	Rural Centre	PCNP used PCC's Rural Facilities 2010 which stated the

			village was a Service Village. PCC upgraded the settlement to a Service Centre based on 2019 evidence. Whilst Llangwm has a higher status in PCCs LDP both hierarchy positions allow market housing to be developed.
Carew (PCC)	Service Village	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Cosheston (PCC)	Service Village	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Hill Mountain (PCC)	Service Village	Countryside	PCNP used PCC's Rural Facilities 2010 which stated the village was a Local Village. PCCs 2019 update changed the position of Hill Mountain to identify it as a Service Village. As only a very small part of the built area falls within PCNPA, the difference in approach here reflects the small extent of the built environment in PCNP's area.
Hook (PCC)	Service Village	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Houghton (PCC)	Service Village	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Llanteglos/Llanteg (PCC)	Service Village	Countryside	PCNP used PCC's Rural Facilities 2010 which stated the village was a Local Village. PCCs 2019 update changed the position of Llanteglos/Llanteg to identify it as a Service Village. As only a very small part of the built area falls within PCNP, the difference in approach here reflects the small extent of the built environment in PCNP's area.
Milton (Split)	Service Village ^[1]	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP

New Hedges (Split)	Service Village	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Roch (PCC)	Service Village	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Square & Compass (Split)	Service Village	Rural Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & PCNP
Summerhill (Split)	Service Village	Countryside	The classification difference between the two authorities is a result of facilities having a weighting in PCC's area, whereas PCNPA require a minimum of 3 services. In this instance the weighting methodology has afforded the settlement a higher place in the hierarchy for PCC than in PCNP. The joint approach will allow for some development within/adjacent to the village if opportunities are available.
Cresselly (Split)	Cluster Village	Local Countryside	Within PCC's jurisdiction discreet areas of Cresselly have been defined within a settlement boundary within which it is considered appropriate for small-scale development to occur. The PCC methodology varies slightly in this location as the categorisation of Cresselly is partly due to its links with other settlements that have facilities. In PCNP any new development in this area would be that permitted in the countryside – conversion of appropriate buildings, exceptional land releases for affordable housing, REW dwellings etc. The approach is different here but small amounts of development could be permitted in and out of the National Park. The scale of the likely development is so small

			the difference of approach is insignificant.
Llanrhian (PCC)	Local Village	Countryside	As only a very small part of the built area falls within PCNP, and comprises the church, manor house and agricultural buildings. The difference in approach here reflects the small extent and character of the built environment in PCNP's area. The joint approach will allow for some development within/adjacent to the village if opportunities are available.
Penycwm (PCC)	Local Village	Countryside	As only a very small part of the built area falls within PCNPA, separated from the rest of the settlement by the A487. The difference in approach here reflects the small extent and nature of the built environment in PCNPAs area. The joint approach will allow for some development within/adjacent to the village if opportunities are available.
Wiseman's Bridge (PCNP)	Cluster Local Village	Rural Centre	Yes – whilst there is a slight difference in categorisation both hierarchy levels will allow a degree of development to take place here.

[1]The shop at Milton was closed during the Rural Facilities 2019 update, so for the Deposit Plan it was a Cluster Local Village, but following the 2020 update, it was re-classified as a Service Village, so following Focussed Changes the settlement will achieve cross boundary conformity.

2.10 Cross boundary conformity is generally achieved, with some minor variations in approach which in some cases reflect the degree of the built environment which fall within the planning authorities' jurisdiction and only in one instance reflect the different methodologies used to identify the categorisation. These small differences will not impact on the compatibility of the two Local Development Plan approaches for these split settlements as they will direct any development to appropriate locations.

The hierarchy position of settlements for LDP2 in Carmarthenshire and PCC, and Ceredigion for LDP1

2.11 The below tables shows the instances of cross-boundary settlements with Carmarthenshire County Council.

Settlement Name & Predominately PCC, Carmarthenshire or split?	PCC	Carmarthenshire	Cross-Boundary Conformity?
Whitland (Carmarthenshire)	Not included in PCC LDP2 Deposit Plan – recommendation to introduce as a Service Centre	Service Centre	Yes – These are equivalent tiers of the hierarchy for PCC & Carmarthenshire

2.12 In the case of Whitland, PCC did not assess the settlement within the Rural Facility study 2019. Following consideration of the Settlement and its importance regionally a change to PCCs LDP2 approach is recommended in this paper to identify the settlement as a Service Village to ensure conformity of approach with Carmarthenhsire.

2.13 There are no Cross Boundary settlements between PCC and Ceredigion County Council

Conclusions

3.1 Pembrokeshire County Council has three neighbouring Planning Authorities, with whom it shares a planning boundary.

3.2 It has no settlements which are ‘split’ with Ceredigion.

3.3 It has one settlement which is ‘split’ with Carmarthenshire – Whitland. Whilst PCC had omitted Whitland from its Rural Facilities study initially, a key recommendation of this paper is that it be identified as a Service Centre with a boundary identified to ensure consistency of approach with Carmarthenshire’s LDP.

3.4 This paper identifies a number of settlements which are ‘split’ settlements falling within the planning jurisdiction of both PCC and PCNPA. Across both areas there is a general conformity of approach. In some cases a settlement is categorised differently, but this in the majority of cases reflects a difference in the extent to which the built environment extends into that Authority’s planning jurisdiction. In one instance a difference in categorisation reflects the different methodologies used. These small differences will not impact on the compatibility of the two Local Development Plan approaches for these split settlements as they will direct any development to appropriate locations.

3.5 PCC considers that in terms of its overall strategy there is a general conformity of approach with its neighbouring authorities in terms of 'split' settlements.