Chapter 6 Schedule of Representations

Of

Focussed Changes Consultation Report

Pembrokeshire County Council

Pembrokeshire Local Development Plan 2

9th October 2025

Contents

6.1. Count of Representations by Topic area

	Reference	Count of Representations
6.3.	Candidate Site Register	4
6.4.	Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	6
6.5.	DP 1. CONTEXT AND KEY ISSUES	1
6.6.	DP 2. VISION AND OBJECTIVES	2
6.7.	DP Glossary	1
6.8.	DP SP 03 Affordable Housing Target	2
6.9.	DP SP 04 Gypsy, Traveller and Show-people's Accommodation	1
6.10.	DP SP 06 – Settlement Hierarchy – A Sustainable Settlement Strategy	3
6.11.	DP SP 07 Settlement Boundaries	16
6.12.	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment	7
6.13.	DP SP 13 Port and Energy Related Development and Celtic Freeport	2
6.14.	DP SP 15 Safeguarding of existing Strategic Employment Sites	1
6.15.	DP SP 17 Visitor Economy	4
6.16.	DP GN 01 General Development Policy	21
6.17.	DP GN 02 Sustainable Design and Placemaking	2
6.18.	DP GN 06 Development Proposals in Pre-Assessed Areas for Wind Energy (as set out in Future Wales)	1
6.19.	DP GN 07 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield	5
6.20.	DP GN 13 Residential Development	4
6.21.	DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards	5
6.22.	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	18
6.23.	DP GN 19A Maesgwynne, Fishguard S/HSG/034F/LDP2/1	2
6.24.	DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing	3
6.25.	DP GN 21 Exception Sites for Local Needs Affordable Housing	1
6.26.	DP GN 22 Specialist and Supported Accommodation	1
6.27.	DP GN 24 Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations	2
6.28.	DP GN 38 Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of the Mineral Resource	2
6.29.	DP GN 44 Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity	1
6.30.	DP GN 46 Coastal Change	2
6.31.	DP GN 48 Green Wedges	2
6.32.	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	9
6.33.	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	10
6.34.	DP GN 57 Site Facilities	3
6.35.	DP GN 58 Self-catering Accommodation	1
6.36.	DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory	3
6.37.	Habitats Regulations Assessment	1
6.38.	SA Appendix 2: Objectives Appraisal	1
	Grand Total	150

6.2. Representors alphabetical order Count of Representations

Representor and Number	Comment	Object	Support	Grand Total
Adrian Harbord		**2**		**2**
3914		**2**		**2**
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		2		2
Ann Lankshear, Fiona Harries, Mark Ferrier, Simon Ferrier, Chris Lankshear		**1**		**1**
4485		**1**		**1**
Carol Davies		**1**		**1**
4482		**1**		**1**
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		1		1
Celtic Homes Ltd			**3**	**3**
4472			**3**	**3**
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations			1	1
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value			1	1
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries			1	1
David Ambrose		**1**		**1**
4083		**1**		**1**
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		1		1
Dewi Griffiths	**4**			**4**
2603	**4**			**4**
Diane Llewhelin		**2**		**2**
4171		**2**		**2**
DP GN 19A Maesgwynne, Fishguard S/HSG/034F/LDP2/1		2		2
Haven Leisure Ltd	**8**	**8**	**4**	**20**
4478	**8**	**8**	**4**	**20**
Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	1	2		3
DP 2. VISION AND OBJECTIVES			1	1
DP GN 1 General Development Policy	7			7
DP GN 48 Green Wedges		1		1
DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development		2	2	4
DP GN 57 Site Facilities		1		1
DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment		2		2
DP SP 17 Visitor Economy			1	1
Ian Evans			**5**	**5**
4474			**5**	**5**
Candidate Site Register			1	1
DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory			1	1
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations			2	2
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries			1	1
J Mills & R Ariss		**5**		**5**
4288		**5**		**5**
DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory		1		1
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		3		3
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		1		1

Representor and Number	Comment	Object	Support	Grand Total
James Ferraby		**1**		**1**
4468		**1**		**1**
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		1		1
Jane Clark-Davies		**1**		**1**
2176		**1**		**1**
DP SP 6 – Settlement Hierarchy – A Sustainable Settlement Strategy		1		1
John James	**1**			**1**
3146	**1**			**1**
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	1			1
Jonathan Cole	**2**		**3**	**5**
4377	**2**		**3**	**5**
DP 1. CONTEXT AND KEY ISSUES			1	1
DP Glossary	1			1
DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards			2	2
DP SP 3 Affordable Housing Target	1			1
Josie Ferraby		**1**		**1**
4469		**1**		**1**
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		1		1
Kathyrn Bradbury			**17**	**17**
34751			**17**	**17**
DP GN 1 General Development Policy			1	1
DP GN 13 Residential Development			2	2
DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing			1	1
DP GN 21 Exception Sites for Local Needs Affordable Housing			1	1
DP GN 46 Coastal Change			1	1
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value			1	1
DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development			3	3
DP GN 57 Site Facilities			1	1
DP GN 58 Self-catering Accommodation			1	1
DP SP 17 Visitor Economy			1	1
DP SP 6 – Settlement Hierarchy – A Sustainable Settlement Strategy			2	2
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries			2	2
L Greggain & Co Ltd		**1**		**1**
4475		**1**		**1**
DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing		1		1
Louise Edwards	**1**			**1**
34450	**1**			**1**
HRA	1			1
Matthew Ellis			**5**	**5**
4421			**5**	**5**
DP GN 7 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield			5	5
Melanie Lindsley			**1**	**1**
2841			**1**	**1**
DP GN 1 General Development Policy			1	1

Representor and Number	Comment	Object	Support	Grand Total
Michael Ireson	**1**			**1**
4481	**1**			**1**
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	1			1
Mike Ings	**1**			**1**
4203	**1**			**1**
DP SP 13 Port and Energy Related Development and Celtic Freeport	1			1
Mr & Mrs Edward & Zita Doyle		**1**		**1**
4484		**1**		**1**
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		1		1
Mr & Mrs P Sherwood		**5**		**5**
4470		**5**		**5**
Candidate Site Register		1		1
DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory		1		1
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		2		2
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		1		1
Mr & Mrs V Rogers		**5**		**5**
2242		**5**		**5**
Candidate Site Register		1		1
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		2		2
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		1		1
SA Appendix 2: Objectives Appraisal		1		1
Mr M & J Morrillo		**3**		**3**
4375		**3**		**3**
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		1		1
DP GN 38 Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of the Mineral Resource		1		1
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		1		1
Mr P Parnell			**1**	**1**
4479			**1**	**1**
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value			1	1
Mr Peter Griffiths			**1**	**1**
34629			**1**	**1**
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries			1	1
Mr W Jenkins		**5**		**5**
1830		**5**		**5**
DP GN 24 Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations		1		1
DP GN 38 Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of the Mineral Resource		1		1
DP GN 48 Green Wedges		1		1
DP SP 4 Gypsy, Traveller and Show-people's Accommodation		1		1
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		1		1
Pauline & Neil Clarke		**1**		**1**
4467		**1**		**1**
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		1		1
Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		**5**	**4**	**9**
4410		**5**	**4**	**9**

Representor and Number	Comment	Object	Support	Grand Total
DP GN 1 General Development Policy			2	2
DP GN 13 Residential Development			1	1
DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards		1		1
DP GN 2 Sustainable Design and Placemaking		1		1
DP GN 22 Specialist and Supported Accommodation		1		1
DP GN 44 Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity			1	1
DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment		2		2
PRL Partnership	**12**	**3**	**3**	**18**
4477	**12**	**3**	**3**	**18**
Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	1	2		3
DP 2. VISION AND OBJECTIVES			1	1
DP GN 1 General Development Policy	7			7
DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	2		1	3
DP GN 57 Site Facilities		1		1
DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment	2			2
DP SP 17 Visitor Economy			1	1
Robin Smith		**1**		**1**
4483		**1**		**1**
DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		1		1
Simon Mann	**9**			**9**
34774	**9**			**9**
DP GN 1 General Development Policy	3			3
DP GN 13 Residential Development	1			1
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	1			1
DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing	1			1
DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment	1			1
DP SP 17 Visitor Economy	1			1
DP SP 3 Affordable Housing Target	1			1
Tony Brinsden	**1**			**1**
4471	**1**			**1**
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	1			1
Uzmaston Boulston & Slebech Community Council		**1**		**1**
34781		**1**		**1**
Candidate Site Register		1		1
Welsh Government	**2**	**4**		**6**
1507	**2**			**2**
DP GN 46 Coastal Change	1			1
DP GN 6 Development Proposals in Pre-Assessed Areas for Wind Energy (as set out in Future Wales)	1			1
4480		**4**		**4**
DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards		2		2
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		1		1
DP GN 2 Sustainable Design and Placemaking		1		1
William James		**2**		**2**
34699		**2**		**2**

Representor and Number	Comment	Object	Support	Grand Total
DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		2		2
Grand Total	**42**	**61**	**47**	**150**

6.3. Candidate Site Register

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2242	Mr & Mrs V Rogers				4	Object	OE18 Candidate Site Register	Candidate Site Register	No	Representor repeats their previous comments regarding the allocation of Site 524 Land front B4586 (HSG/047/LDP2/1 Land south of the Crown) The village does not have the infrastructure for the housing development - no shops, public transport. The development would cause more traffic on already busy narrow roads, heavily used by farm machinery. The local school is full. There is wildlife on site that would be severley impacted by the development. The LDP Issue Report references two trees in the hedgerow fronting the B4586 having Ash Dieback. Only one tree has this. The ash and sycamore opposite High Croft and Casa-mia properties are healthy. The site is prone to flooding and has a stream running through it. There are mine workings on site. There are no main sewers in the village. Site 375 (allocated in LDP1) would be sufficient to meet future housing needs.						Please see response to representation 2242/1.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4470	Mr & Mrs P Sherwood				5	Object	OE18 Candidate Site Register	Candidate Site Register		The representor objects to the proposed development at HSG/047/LDP2/1 due to the lack of sewerage, lack of services, the school being at maximum capacity, marshy ground with drainage issues. The land is ecologically important. The site is not served by footways and the roads are heavily trafficked, make it unsafe for pedestrians. The site has known coal workings, which has been raised by the Coal Authority. The Council previously came to the view during an earlier consultation on candidate sites that the land wasn't needed to meet the level of growth required - what has changed? The representor has family living opposite the proposed development and it will impact them severely.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/5				Please see response to representation 4470/1	No
4474	Ian Evans		4277	JCR Planning Ltd	5	Support	OE18 Candidate Site Register	Candidate Site Register	Yes	See representation 4474/1	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34781	Uzmaston Boulston & Slebech Community Council				1	Object	Not Applicable	Candidate Site Register		Uzmaston Community Council reiterate longstanding concerns regarding traffic increase if there were development of Bethany Fields. • The impact on New Road which already has parking issues. • Impact on Statutory Services already overloaded. • The impact of Development in the countryside with it being visible from the main arterial road, A40. • The visual impacts on the landscape. In other parts of the LDP sites where a visual impact might be apparent, green wedges are provided to buffer development from open countryside. This should be applied here.	Uzmaston					The representation **is not duly made** as it does not relate to a Focussed Change to Local Development Plan 2, Deposit Plan 2. The Council has rejected the development proposals put forward by Candidate Sites 062, 063, 064 and 065 at Bethany Fields, as is made clear both in LDP 2 itself and in the Candidate Sites' Register and Site Assessment (September 2024). The representation relating to policy GN 48 Green Wedges should have been made during the Deposit stage consultation in autumn 2024.	No

6.4. Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL artnership		4409	Lichfields	16	Object	OE14	Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	No	PRL Partnership objects to OE14. Previous representation stated that, for the purpose of the SPG, the information should be clear and solely relate to PCC. Although the County and National Park do share landscape elements, their differences and nuances should also be understood if it is to inform decision-making for applications made to the County Council." PRL Partnership queries the sentence before Table 2 as the methodology for the SPG should be created in mind for the County rather than using information and methodology intended for a separate LPA. The change appears to emphasise that the methodology was created for the National Park rather than reassuring that the document is robust and could be used as a material consideration for the PCC.						There is nothing further to add to the Council's response set out in the Issues Paper (see under section 4.23 Supplementary Planning Guidance: Carvan, Camping and Chalet Landscape Capacity Assessment paragraph 9) see Appendix 4 ot the Consultation Report Ref SD09 https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	17	Object	OE15	Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	No	PRL Partnership has no object to the principle of the proposed change in relation to OE15, relating to the SPG stating that static caravans are the most highly visible form of development. It is not accurate in all circumstances, when having regard to the impact of some chalets. If it is considered necessary to make a statement, wording might be "static caravans and chalets can be a highly visible form of accommodation". This reflects that some sites/part of are well designed and well-integrated with limit views beyond boundaries.						There is nothing further to add to the Council's response set out in the Issues Paper (see under Apppendix 4 section 4.23 Supplementary Planning Guidance: Carvan, Camping and Chalet Landscape Capacity Assessment, paragraph 14)https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission	No
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	18	Comment	OE16	Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	No	See Row below						It is not clear what matter the representor wishes to raise in relation to OE16 as no details have been provided. No further comment is therefore provided.	No

PRL Partnership has no object to the principle of the proposed change in relation to OE15, relating to the SPG stating that static caravans are the most highly visible form of development. It is not accurate in all circumstances, when having regard to the impact of some chalets. If it is considered necessary to make a statement, wording might be "static caravans and chalets can be a highly visible form of accommodation". This reflects that some sites/part of are well designed and well-integrated with limit views beyond boundaries.

PRL Partnership objects to OE14. Previous representation stated that, for the purpose of the SPG, the information should be clear and solely relate to PCC. Although the County and National Park do share landscape elements, their differences and nuances should also be understood if it is to inform decision-making for applications made to the County Council." PRL Partnership queries the sentence before Table 2 as the methodology for the SPG should be created in mind for the County rather than using information and methodology intended for a separate LPA. The change appears to emphasise that the methodology was created for the National Park rather than reassuring that the document is robust and could be used as a material consideration for the PCC.

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	17	Object	OE14	Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	No	Haven objects to OE14. Previous representation stated that, for the purpose of the SPG, the information should be clear and solely relate to PCC. Although the County and National Park do share landscape elements, their differences and nuances should also be understood if it is to inform decision-making for applications made to the County Council." Haven queries the sentence before Table 2 as the methodology for the SPG should be created in mind for the County rather than using information and methodology intended for a separate LPA. The change appears to emphasise that the methodology was created for the National Park rather than reassuring that the document is robust and could be used as a material consideration for the PCC.						There is nothing further to add to the Council's response set out in the Issues Paper weblink: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission (see under Supporting Documents, Appendix 4 Issues Papers updated 23 September 2025 section 4.23 Supplementary Planning Guidance: Carvan, Camping and Chalet Landscape Capacity Assessment)	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	18	Object	OE15	Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	No	Haven has no object to the principle of the proposed change in relation to OE15, relating to the SPG stating that static caravans are the most highly visible form of development. It is not accurate in all circumstances, when having regard to the impact of some chalets. If it is considered necessary to make a statement, wording might be "static caravans and chalets can be a highly visible form of accommodation". This reflects that some sites/part of are well designed and well-integrated with limit views beyond boundaries.						There is nothing further to add to the Council's response set out in the Issues Paper (see under section 4.23 Supplementary Planning Guidance: Carvan, Camping and Chalet Landscape Capacity Assessment) https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission See Appendix 4 Secton 4.23.	No
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	19	Comment	OE16	Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance	No	See Row below						It is not clear if the representor is supporting or objecting to OE16 as no details have been provided.	No

Haven has no object to the principle of the proposed change in relation to OE15, relating to the SPG stating that static caravans are the most highly visible form of development. It is not accurate in all circumstances, when having regard to the impact of some chalets. If it is considered necessary to make a statement, wording might be "static caravans and chalets can be a highly visible form of accommodation". This reflects that some sites/part of are well designed and well-integrated with limit views beyond boundaries.

Haven objects to OE14. Previous representation stated that, for the purpose of the SPG, the information should be clear and solely relate to PCC. Although the County and National Park do share landscape elements, their differences and nuances should also be understood if it is to inform decision-making for applications made to the County Council." Haven queries the sentence before Table 2 as the methodology for the SPG should be created in mind for the County rather than using information and methodology intended for a separate LPA. The change appears to emphasise that the methodology was created for the National Park rather than reassuring that the document is robust and could be used as a material consideration for the PCC.

6.5. DP 1. CONTEXT AND KEY ISSUES

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4377	Jonathan Cole	ATEB Group Ltd	4376	Stantec	2	Support	FC1.Context.03	DP 1. CONTEXT AND KEY ISSUES	Yes	See Row below.	Letterston	HSG/053/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

DP Glossary

Support for replacing the description of Affordable Housing to reflect TAN 2. (FC1.Context.01)

DP1 Context and Issues

Support for the replacement of references to NVZs in Wales with updated text (FC1.Context.03)

DP SP3 Affordable Housing Targets DP

Comments recognise that the proposed change to include a table indentifying the tenured split for affordable housing delivery and showing the over housing need should increase the range of affordable housing that can be delivered and ensure the majority of provision is for those most in need. (FC4.SP03.01)

DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards

Support the amendments refering the latest published evidence and the included reference 'or equivalent' in relation to the approach to Lifetime Homes Standards under Policy GN.15.

DP GN 16 Residential Allocations

DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing

The representor takes issue with how well GN 20 expands upon the calculations of the commuted sum considered necessary. The Affordable Housing SPG provides commuted sum calculations for corresponding affordable housing requirements but from the point of 5% upwards, with no sum equivalent provided for those areas where 0% is the target affordable housing. They suggest simplifying the structure of the policy and commit to robust monitoring and review processes, and simplify a way of calculating the commuted sums.

6.6. DP 2. VISION AND OBJECTIVES

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	1	Support	FC2.Vision. 01	DP 2. VISION AND OBJECTIVES	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses change FC2.Vision.01. It reflects our client's representation to the Deposit consultation.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	1	Support	FC2.Vision. 01	DP 2. VISION AND OBJECTIVES	Yes	Haven Leisure Limited endorses FC2.Vision.01 which addresses concerns highlighted in previous representations.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.7. DP Glossary

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4377	Jonathan Cole	ATEB Group Ltd	4376	Stantec	1	Comment	FC1.Context.01	DP Glossary	Yes	See Row below	Letterston	HSG/053/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

DP Glossary

Support for replacing the description of Affordable Housing to reflect TAN 2. (FC1.Context.01)

DP1 Context and Issues

Support for the replacement of references to NVZs in Wales with updated text (FC1.Context.03)

DP SP3 Affordable Housing Targets DP

Comments recognise that the proposed change to include a table indentifying the tenured split for affordable housing delivery and showing the over housing need should increase the range of affordable housing that can be delivered and ensure the majority of provision is for those most in need. (FC4.SP03.01)

DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards

Support the amendments refering the latest published evidence and the included reference 'or equivalent' in relation to the approach to Lifetime Homes Standards under Policy GN.15.

DP GN 16 Residential Allocations

DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing

The representor takes issue with how well GN 20 expands upon the calculations of the commuted sum considered necessary. The Affordable Housing SPG provides commuted sum calculations for corresponding affordable housing requirements but from the point of 5% upwards, with no sum equivalent provided for those areas where 0% is the target affordable housing. They suggest simplifying the structure of the policy and commit to robust monitoring and review processes, and simplify a way of calculating the commuted sums.

6.8. DP SP 3 Affordable Housing Target

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4377	Jonathan Cole	ATEB Group Ltd	4376	Stantec	3	Comment	FC4.SP03.01	DP SP 3 Affordable Housing Target	Yes	See Row below	Letterston	HSG/053/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

DP Glossary
Support for replacing the description of Affordable Housing to reflect TAN 2. (FC1.Context.01)
DP1 Context and Issues
Support for the replacement of references to NVZs in Wales with updated text (FC1.Context.03)
DP SP3 Affordable Housing Targets DP
Comments recognise that the proposed change to include a table indentifying the tenured split for affordable housing delivery and showing the over housing need should increase the range of affordable housing that can be delivered and ensure the majority of provision is for those most in need. (FC4.SP03.01)
DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards
Support the amendments refering the latest published evidence and the included reference 'or equivalent' in relation to the approach to Lifetime Homes Standards under Policy GN.15.
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations
DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing
The representor takes issue with how well GN 20 expands upon the calculations of the commuted sum considered necessary. The Affordable Housing SPG provides commuted sum calculations for corresponding affordable housing requirements but from the point of 5% upwards, with no sum equivalent provided for those areas where 0% is the target affordable housing. They suggest simplifying the structure of the policy and commit to robust monitoring and review processes, and simplify a way of calculating the commuted sums.

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			1	Comment	FC4.SP03.01	DP SP 3 Affordable Housing Target	No	Positive Observations: FC4.SP17.01: Tourism policy changes support economic development appropriate for heritage locations FC4.SP12.01: Environmental protection measures support designated sites FC4.SP03.01: Social rented housing target address identified needs St Davids Parish would benefit from policies that balance heritage protection, rural sustainability and appropriate economic development.			Comment noted. No change required.				No

6.9. DP SP 4 Gypsy, Traveller and Show-people's Accommodation

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
1830	Mr W Jenkins	Priory Farm	3911	A C Crompton	1	Object	FC4.SP04.01	DP SP 4 Gypsy, Traveller and Show-people's Accommodation	No	Removal of Gypsy Site Allocation GT/095/LDP2/1 Castle Quarry Eastern Extension FC4.SP04.01 - Council removed the site due to 'representations received' and updated information regarding deliverability and capacity issues. However, the Council have been in negotiations to acquire this site for 5 years. Delays have been due to Council's failure to take decisive action - partly fuelled by a revolving door of continuing changes in personnel dealing with matters on behalf of the Council. The Council's decision to remove this site from LDP2 is disappointing and has left the land owners with abortive legal and surveyor costs.	Pembroke	GT/095/LDP2/1		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		The Council's consideration of the appropriateness of allocating this site and provision more generally is set out in detail in https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission (SD09) Consultation Report Appendix 4. Section 4.6. Paragraph 7,8 and 9 sets out the reasoning in relation to proposing the deletion of this allocation. It is correct to say that the Council has not received any adverse comment from external commentators. In terms of the Castle Quarry site. However, the site Adjacent to Monkton Playing Field is considered to be on balance a preferable site for allocation. Objection to this site has been raised however, which will need to be considered throught the Examination. The extension of the Green Wedge is a logical consequential change as a result of the proposed deletion of the allocation at Castle Quarry. Potential issues regarding the how the allocation is currently used would be outside the remit of the Local Development Plan.	No

6.10. DP SP 6 – Settlement Hierarchy

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2176	Jane Clark-Davies	Llanstadwell Community Council			1	Object	Not Applicable	DP SP 6 – Settlement Hierarchy – A Sustainable Settlement Strategy	No	Representor references FC4.SP06 relating to Llanstadwell. The Council objects to the proposed development of land East of Hazelbank HSG/066/LDP2/1 as the representor feels the allocation does not satisfy the criteria listed under GN 1 General Development Policy ie criterion 1 (the nature, location, siting and scale of proposed development is not compatible with the capacity and character of the site and the area within which it is located) criterion 6 (the development is not in an accessible location and it does not incorporate sustainable transport and accessibility principles) and criterion 7 (the development does not have the necessary and appropriate service infrastructure with poor access and parking) The narrow roads of Hazelbeach deprive it of its bus service.	Llanstadwell	HSG/066/LDP2/1				The representation is unfortunately **not duly made** as it does not relate to a proposed Focussed Change of Local Development Plan 2 Deposit 2 and therefore officers have not considered this representation further. However, it is useful to be aware that the appropriateness of the site's suitability for allocation was objected to at Deposit Stage by others and therefore will be before the Inspector for consideration.	No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			1	Support	FC4.SP06.Llanteg.etc.01	DP SP 6 – Settlement Hierarchy – A Sustainable Settlement Strategy	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.	Llanteg & Llanteglos		Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			2	Support	FC4.SP06.Llanteg.etc.02	DP SP 6 – Settlement Hierarchy – A Sustainable Settlement Strategy	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.	Llanteg & Llanteglos		Support welcomed. No change required.			The Council's reason for the Focussed Changes are set out in detail in the Issues Paper - Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report (Ref SD09). weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission See section 4.12 Llanteg/Llanteglos. The assets referred to in this representation have already been taken into account. There are no public transport routes in the locality and the bus shelter is a legacy feature. Availability of land for residential development is appropriate for a 'Local Village' with few facilities. No further change is proposed as a result of this representation.	No

6.11. DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
1830	Mr W Jenkins	Priory Farm	3911	A C Crompton	2	Object	FC4.SP07.Pembroke.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	No	Removal of Gypsy Site Allocation GT/095/LDP2/1 Castle Quarry Eastern Extension FC4.SP07.Pembroke.01 - The Council should build in a degree of 'flexibility' into the total number of new Gypsy Traveller Site Pitches in order to make allowance for potential slippage and as yet, unknown site constraints that could affect the proposed site allocations.	Pembroke	GT/095/LDP2/2		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		See Response to 1830/1	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2242	Mr & Mrs V Rogers				1	Object	FC4.SP07.Jeffreyston.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	No	Representor repeats their previous comments regarding the allocation of Site 524 Land front B4586 (HSG/047/LDP2/1 Land south of the Crown) The village does not have the infrastructure for the housing development - no shops, public transport. The development would cause more traffic on already busy narrow roads, heavily used by farm machinery. The local school is full. There is wildlife on site that would be severley impacted by the development. The LDP Issue Report references two trees in the hedgerow fronting the B4586 having Ash Dieback. Only one tree has this. The ash and sycamore opposite High Croft and Casa-mia properties are healthy. The site is prone to flooding and has a stream running through it. There are mine workings on site. There are no main sewers in the village. Site 375 (allocated in LDP1) would be sufficient to meet future housing needs.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				The Council's reason for the Focussed Changes are set out in detail in the Issues Paper - Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report (Ref SD09). There are no further matters raised in this representation to alter the Council's response. weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission See section 4.10 Jeffryston	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
3146	John James				1	Comment	FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		Representor seeks clarity regarding the designation of Llanteg and Llanteglos. Representor notes that Llanteglos is to be deleted from Band 3 table, although they state they are not sure what this means. On page 17 and 35 Llanteglos is removed from the Open Space designation from the proposed map? Representor would be grateful for official clarification regarding their comments.	Llanteg & Llanteglos					The referencing used in the Council's response regarding 'Llanteg' and' Llanteglos' has caused confusion. For clarity the Focussed Change relates to removal of a settlement boundary from around the group of houses south of the A477 for the reasons set out in the Issues Paper. No further change is required in relation to this representation. Further explanation on the points raised can be provided to the representor outside of the Examination process. See https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission Appendix 4 - Issues Papers updated 23 September 2025 Section 4.12 for the background to the change.	No
3914	Adrian Harbord				1	Object	FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	No	See Row below	Llanteg & Llanteglos	Candidate Site 220				The Council's reason for the Focussed Changes are set out in detail in the Issues Paper - Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report (Ref SD09). There are no further matters raised in this representation to alter the Council's response. weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission Section 4.12 for the background to the change.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
Objection to the revised focus change for Llanteg in LDP2 and exclusion of development land adjacent to Lansdowne. The revised focus fails to reflect the village's existing infrastructure, recent investments, and community assets, and risks undermining future housing development - including affordable housing - over the next decade. While Llanteg may fall slightly short on the points system, the margin is minimal, and the village meets many of the functional criteria expected of a Service Village. - Commercial viability: Whilst the bar and restaurant at Wanderers Rest and Llanteglos Lodges are closed, the premises retains a valid license. Therefore, there is potential for reopening. - Community Assets & public spaces: Millenium woodland, Claypits, Old School Garden, Crunwere Church, Llanteg Village Hall. There are spaces to support community engagement and informal recreation. - Recent Investment and Local Enterprise: upgraded petrol station, artisan bakery, market garden selling produce, milk vending machine, locally sourced meat and dairy products all reflect a growing local economy and increased self-sufficiency. - Transport infrastructure: bus shelter in place, demonstrating readiness for future public transport integration. Excluding the Development of Land Adjacent to Lansdowne which was included in LDP2. - Removes realistic opportunities for housing development in Llanteg over the next 10 years. - Significant portion of the original proposal was intended for affordable housing, exclusion of land jeopardizes delivery of needed affordable homes. - The exclusion contradicts principles of sustainable development and rural regeneration. It disregards previous assessments that concluded Llanteg is a Service Village. Recommendation: Reinstate Llanteg's destination as Service Village and include development land adjacent to Lansdowne in the final LDP2.																	
3914	Adrian Harbord				2	Object	FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.02	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	No	See Row below	Llanteg & Llanteglos	Candidate Site 221				Please see response to Representation 3914/1	No
Objection to the revised focus change for Llanteg in LDP2 and exclusion of development land adjacent to Lansdowne. The revised focus fails to reflect the village's existing infrastructure, recent investments, and community assets, and risks undermining future housing development - including affordable housing - over the next decade. While Llanteg may fall slightly short on the points system, the margin is minimal, and the village meets many of the functional criteria expected of a Service Village. - Commercial viability: Whilst the bar and restaurant at Wanderers Rest and Llanteglos Lodges are closed, the premises retains a valid license. Therefore, there is potential for reopening. - Community Assets & public spaces: Millenium woodland, Claypits, Old School Garden, Crunwere Church, Llanteg Village Hall. There are spaces to support community engagement and informal recreation. - Recent Investment and Local Enterprise: upgraded petrol station, artisan bakery, market garden selling produce, milk vending machine, locally sourced meat and dairy products all reflect a growing local economy and increased self-sufficiency. - Transport infrastructure: bus shelter in place, demonstrating readiness for future public transport integration. Excluding the Development of Land Adjacent to Lansdowne which was included in LDP2. - Removes realistic opportunities for housing development in Llanteg over the next 10 years. - Significant portion of the original proposal was intended for affordable housing, exclusion of land jeopardizes delivery of needed affordable homes. - The exclusion contradicts principles of sustainable development and rural regeneration. It disregards previous assessments that concluded Llanteg is a Service Village. Recommendation: Reinstate Llanteg's destination as Service Village and include development land adjacent to Lansdowne in the final LDP2.																	

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4288	J Mills & R Ariss				1	Object	FC4.SP07.Jeffreyston.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	Yes	An objection to HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) due to concerns regarding the busy highway, frequented by tractors and trailers, and the inability of the school to accommodate any more students. Development of HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) would disrupt lives and businesses. The smaller site identified would be a much better location to focus development, and would cause minimal disruption.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				The Council's reason for the Focussed Changes are set out in detail in the Issues Paper - Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report (Ref SD09). There are no further matters raised in this representation to alter the Council's response. weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission See section 4.10 Jeffreyston	No
4470	Mr & Mrs P Sherwood				1	Object	FC4.SP07.Jeffreyston.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		The representor objects to the proposed development at HSG/047/LDP2/1 due to the lack of sewerage, lack of services, the school being at maximum capacity, marshy ground with drainage issues. The land is ecologically important. The site is not served by footways and the roads are heavily trafficked, make it unsafe for pedestrians. The site has known coal workings, which has been raised by the Coal Authority. The Council previously came to the view during an earlier consultation on candidate sites that the land wasn't needed to meet the level of growth required - what has changed? The representor has family living opposite the proposed development and it will impact them severely.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				The Council's reason for the Focussed Changes are set out in detail in the Issues Paper - Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report (Ref SD09). There are no further matters raised in this representation to alter the Council's response. weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission See section 4.10 Jeffryston	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4471	Tony Brinsden				1	Comment	FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries		LDP refers to two areas, Llanteg and Llanteglos. The correct title for the whole area of this area is Llanteg, there has never been a separate area known as Llanteglos. The area should just be referred to as Llanteg, only. There should be a moratorium on further planning in Llanteg until a mains sewerage scheme is installed. St Elidyrs Church was made redundant in 2009, not 40 years ago as stated in Amroth Community Council submission.	Llanteg & Llanteglos					It seems that the area known as Llanteglos forms part of the wider area generally known as Llanteg. The Focussed Change relates to removal of a settlement boundary from around the group of houses south of the A477 for the reasons set out in the Issues Paper. See weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission See section 4.12 Llanteg/Llanteglos. No further change is required in relation to this representation.	No
4472	Celtic Homes Ltd		1955	Boyer Planning	1	Support	FC4.SP07.Pembroke.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	Yes	See Row Below	Pembroke Dock	HSG/096/LDP2/3	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
Land at Upper Sycamore Woods, Pembroke Dock (formerly Candidate Site 074) now HSG/096/LDP2/3 - focussed change FC5.GN16.PembrokeDock.02 We welcome the focussed changes, which confirm the site's allocation for residential development (HSG/096/LDP2/3) and removal of the previous open space designation. Earlier representations raised concerns regarding the plan period (2017-2033) and whilst the Focussed Changes do not alter the plan period, the inclusion of the site as a new housing allocation helps mitigate some of the risks associated with the compressed Plan timeframe. Allocating HSG/096/LDP2/3 increases the Council's short term deliverable supply, reducing reliance on long-term allocations. **FC4.SP07.PembrokeDock.01** - Support the change to include new housing allocation HSG/096/LDP2/3, which will provide the Council with greater flexibility to guard against non-delivery. The allocation of this site will help to ensure that housing land supply is genuinely resilient. It is imperative that a positive and proactive approach is adopted to accommodate new housing, which will support the delivery of employment.																
4474	Ian Evans		4277	JCR Planning Ltd	2	Support	FC4.SP07.Jeffreyston.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	Yes	See representation 4474/1	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34629	Mr Peter Griffiths		4273	BABB Architects Ltd	1	Support	FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.02	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	Yes	Representor suppports the amendment to Llanteg & Llanteglos settlement boundary through FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.02	Llanteg & Llanteglos		Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34699	William James				1	Object	FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	No	See Row below.	Llanteg & Llanteglos	Candidate Site 220				The Council's reason for the Focussed Changes are set out in detail in the Issues Paper - Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report (Ref SD09). weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission See section 4.12 Llanteg/Llanteglos. The assets referred to in this representation have already been taken into account. There are no public transport routes in the locality and the bus shelter is a legacy feature. Availability of land for residential development is appropriate for a 'Local Village' with few facilities. No further change is proposed as a result of this representation.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
Objection to the revised focus change for Llanteg in LDP2 and exclusion of development land adjacent to Lansdowne. The revised focus fails to reflect the village's existing infrastructure, recent investments, and community assets, and risks undermining future housing development - including affordable housing - over the next decade. While Llanteg may fall slightly short on the points system, the margin is minimal, and the village meets many of the functional criteria expected of a Service Village. - Commercial viability: Whilst the bar and restaurant at Wanderers Rest and Llanteglos Lodges are closed, the premises retains a valid license. Therefore, there is potential for reopening. - Community Assets & public spaces: Millenium woodland, Claypits, Old School Garden, Crunwere Church, Llanteg Village Hall. There are spaces to support community engagement and informal recreation. - Recent Investment and Local Enterprise: upgraded petrol station, artisan bakery, market garden selling produce, milk vending machine, locally sourced meat and dairy products all reflect a growing local economy and increased self-sufficiency. - Transport infrastructure: bus shelter in place, demonstrating readiness for future public transport integration. Excluding the Development of Land Adjacent to Lansdowne which was included in LDP2. - Removes realistic opportunities for housing development in Llanteg over the next 10 years. - Significant portion of the original proposal was intended for affordable housing, exclusion of land jeopardizes delivery of needed affordable homes. - The exclusion contradicts principles of sustainable development and rural regeneration. It disregards previous assessments that concluded Llanteg is a Service Village. Recommendation: Reinstate Llanteg's destination as Service Village and include development land adjacent to Lansdowne in the final LDP2																
34699	William James				2	Object	FC4.SP07.Llanteg.etc.02	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	No	See Row below.	Llanteg & Llanteglos	Candidate Site 221				Please see response to representation 34699/1	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
										Objection to the revised focus change for Llanteg in LDP2 and exclusion of development land adjacent to Lansdowne. The revised focus fails to reflect the village's existing infrastructure, recent investments, and community assets, and risks undermining future housing development - including affordable housing - over the next decade. While Llanteg may fall slightly short on the points system, the margin is minimal, and the village meets many of the functional criteria expected of a Service Village. - Commercial viability: Whilst the bar and restaurant at Wanderers Rest and Llanteglos Lodges are closed, the premises retains a valid license. Therefore, there is potential for reopening. - Community Assets & public spaces: Millenium woodland, Claypits, Old School Garden, Crunwere Church, Llanteg Village Hall. There are spaces to support community engagement and informal recreation. - Recent Investment and Local Enterprise: upgraded petrol station, artisan bakery, market garden selling produce, milk vending machine, locally sourced meat and dairy products all reflect a growing local economy and increased self-sufficiency. - Transport infrastructure: bus shelter in place, demonstrating readiness for future public transport integration. Excluding the Development of Land Adjacent to Lansdowne which was included in LDP2. - Removes realistic opportunities for housing development in Llanteg over the next 10 years. - Significant portion of the original proposal was intended for affordable housing, exclusion of land jeopardizes delivery of needed affordable homes. - The exclusion contradicts principles of sustainable development and rural regeneration. It disregards previous assessments that concluded Llanteg is a Service Village. Recommendation: Reinstate Llanteg's destination as Service Village and include development land adjacent to Lansdowne in the final LDP2.						
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			3	Support	FC4.SP07. Llanteg.etc 01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.	Llanteg & Llanteglos		Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			4	Support	FC4.SP07. Llanteg.etc 01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.	Llanteg & Llanteglos		Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4375	Mr M & J Morrillo		1966	Evans Banks Planning Ltd	1	Object	FC4.SP07.HillMountain.01	DP SP 7 Settlement Boundaries	No	See row below.	Hill Mountain	HSG/043/LDP2/1		The housing provision is set out in detail in the Plan to respond to the Plan's housing requirement and it is considered to be sufficient without the need to consider further housing sites.		See row below.	No

Representor Comment: The representor supports the inclusion of additional land proposed in settlement boundary, but objects to the proposed omission of the element previously included as part of the proposals in the Deposit 2 document. The rationale for the changes made to allocation HSG/043/LDP2/1 Adjacent to Brackenhurst is not entirely clear. Through the 'net' increase in the allocation's area, the Council are anticipating that the allocation will deliver 30 units. However, when the amended Settlement Boundary is plotted on the previously submitted site layout, the ability to achieve these numbers in an appropriate manner is questioned.
The reduction in the allocation's depth would create a much denser form of development with the 30 units required, which may not result in a 'better layout for the settlement'.

PCC Response why edit is not required: For the reasons previously set out in the Deposit 2 stage, the Plan will not deliver the required level of new housing during the Plan Period, and the Focussed Changes discussed herein will not change this outcome.

At Deposit stage, the representor objected to the residential allocation at Hill Mountain, suggesting an alternative site area. The allocation of the Deposit Plan was an amalgam of parts of a variety of Candidate Sites submitted by the representor. The Deposit stage objection proposed a much larger allocation with different boundaries, albeit in the same general area of the village. In assessing the Deposit stage representation, the Council concluded that using all of the land area suggested by the representor for the residential allocation would provide a disproportionate level of growth when compared to the size of village and result in a poor layout at the western end of the site. However, it was also accepted that the allocation boundaries could be amended in a manner that would allow a better internal layout for the site which would also provide an appropriate scale of future growth and a better spatial fit for the settlement as a whole. In so doing, the spatial extent of the allocation was modified and there was a net gain of 0.19 hectares, equating to four additional dwellings to be added to the total to be delivered beyond the Plan period. The representor has indicated support for the inclusion of additional land overall, but would wish to see reinstated the element of the Deposit stage allocation which was removed. The Council is of the view that to do this would undermine the purpose of re-configuring the residential allocation and would provide a disproportionate scale of growth for a village of this size and result in a poorer layout. Hence, no further modification to the allocation is proposed in advance of Examination. In terms of the density of development proposed, the revised site area following the Focussed Change is 1.35 hectares, with 30 dwellings proposed in total (15 in the Plan period and a further 15 beyond the Plan period). That equates to a density of just under the 23 dph envisaged by policy GN 13.

6.12. DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	1	Object	FC4.SP12.01	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment	No	Pembrokeshire Living Limited does not object to FC4.SP12.01 Pembrokeshire Living Limited endorses the changing of wording to 'maintained and enhanced' and amendment 'delivering a net benefit for biodiversity' of FC4.SP12.02. However, the changes that would require developed in SSSI to be wholly exceptional are not consistent with PPW Paragraph 6.4.25, which notes that development not necessary for management of a SSSI should be avoided. The policy says that there may be desirable interventions in SSSIs to secure its role as a living landscape. Policy SP 12 should be consistent with national policy in the absence of a justification to deviate.				The amendment suggested is already addressed by the Plan. No change is needed.		Policy SP 12 Maintaining and Enhanciong the Natural Environment provides a strategic context for considering development proposals which would predominantly would be those that are provided for in the Plan . Policy GN 41 Protection of National Statutory Environmental Designations sets out a more detailed policy regarding development proposals within National Statutory Designations and covers positive interventions in SSSIs to secure their role as a living landscape - criterion 1. This is consistent with national policy. A change to the strategic policy is not required.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	2	Object	FC4.SP12.02	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment	No	Pembrokeshire Living Limited does not object to FC4.SP12.01 Pembrokeshire Living Limited endorses the changing of wording to 'maintained and enhanced' and amendment 'delivering a net benefit for biodiversity' of FC4.SP12.02. However, the changes that would require developed in SSSI to be wholly exceptional are not consistent with PPW Paragraph 6.4.25, which notes that development not necessary for management of a SSSI should be avoided. The policy says that there may be desirable interventions in SSSIs to secure its role as a living landscape. Policy SP 12 should be consistent with national policy in the absence of a justification to deviate.				The amendment suggested is already addressed by the Plan. No change is needed.		Policy SP 12 Maintaining and Enhanciong the Natural Environment provides a strategic context for considering development proposals which would predominantly would be those that are provided for in the Plan . Policy GN 41 Protection of National Statutory Environmental Designations sets out a more detailed policy regarding development proposals within National Statutory Designations and covers positive interventions in SSSIs to secure their role as a living landscape - criterion 1. This is consistent with national policy. A change to the strategic policy is not required.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	2	Comment	FC4.SP12.01	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment		PRL Partnership does not object to FC4.SP12.02. PRL Partnership endorses the change of wording to 'maintained and enhanced' to reflect national policy. However, the changes that would require developed in SSSI to be wholly exceptional are not consistent with PPW Paragraph 6.4.25, which notes that development not necessary for management of a SSSI should be avoided. The policy says that there may be desirable interventions in SSSIs to secure its role as a living landscape. Policy SP 12 should be consistent with national policy in the absence of a justification to deviate.				The amendment suggested is already addressed by the Plan. No change is needed.		Policy SP 12 Maintaining and Enhanciong the Natural Environment provides a strategic context for considering development proposals which would predominantly would be those that are provided for in the Plan . Policy GN 41 Protection of National Statutory Environmental Designations sets out a more detailed policy regarding development proposals within National Statutory Designations and covers positive interventions in SSSIs to secure their role as a living landscape - criterion 1. This is consistent with national policy. A change to the strategic policy is not required.	No
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	3	Comment	FC4.SP12.02	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment		PRL Partnership does not object to FC4.SP12.02. PRL Partnership endorses the change of wording to 'maintained and enhanced' to reflect national policy. However, the changes that would require developed in SSSI to be wholly exceptional are not consistent with PPW Paragraph 6.4.25, which notes that development not necessary for management of a SSSI should be avoided. The policy says that there may be desirable interventions in SSSIs to secure its role as a living landscape. Policy SP 12 should be consistent with national policy in the absence of a justification to deviate.				The amendment suggested is already addressed by the Plan. No change is needed.		Policy SP 12 Maintaining and Enhanciong the Natural Environment provides a strategic context for considering development proposals which would predominantly would be those that are provided for in the Plan . Policy GN 41 Protection of National Statutory Environmental Designations sets out a more detailed policy regarding development proposals within National Statutory Designations and covers positive interventions in SSSIs to secure their role as a living landscape - criterion 1. This is consistent with national policy. A change to the strategic policy is not required.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	3	Object	FC4.SP12.01	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment		Haven acknowledges the addition of FC4.SP12.01 and does not object. Haven endorses the changing of wording to 'maintained and enhanced' and amendment 'delivering a net benefit for biodiversity' of FC4.SP12.02. However, the changes that would require developed in SSSI to be wholly exceptional are not consistent with PPW Paragraph 6.4.25, which notes that development not necessary for management of a SSSI should be avoided. The policy says that there may be desirable interventions in SSSIs to secure its role as a living landscape. Policy SP 12 should be consistent with national policy in the absence of a justification to deviate.				The amendment suggested is already addressed by the Plan. No change is needed.		Policy SP 12 Maintaining and Enhanciong the Natural Environment provides a strategic context for considering development proposals which would predominantly would be those that are provided for in the Plan . Policy GN 41 Protection of National Statutory Environmental Designations sets out a more detailed policy regarding development proposals within National Statutory Designations and covers positive interventions in SSSIs to secure their role as a living landscape - criterion 1. This is consistent with national policy. A change to the strategic policy is not required.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	2	Object	FC4.SP12.01	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment		Haven acknowledges the addition of FC4.SP12.01 and does not object. Haven endorses the changing of wording to 'maintained and enhanced' and amendment 'delivering a net benefit for biodiversity' of FC4.SP12.02. However, the changes that would require developed in SSSI to be wholly exceptional are not consistent with PPW Paragraph 6.4.25, which notes that development not necessary for management of a SSSI should be avoided. The policy says that there may be desirable interventions in SSSIs to secure its role as a living landscape. Policy SP 12 should be consistent with national policy in the absence of a justification to deviate.				The amendment suggested is already addressed by the Plan. No change is needed.		Policy SP 12 Maintaining and Enhanciong the Natural Environment provides a strategic context for considering development proposals which would predominantly be those that are provided for in the Plan . Policy GN 41 Protection of National Statutory Environmental Designations sets out a more detailed policy regarding development proposals within National Statutory Designations and covers positive interventions in SSSIs to secure their role as a living landscape - criterion 1. This is consistent with national policy. A change to the strategic policy is not required.	No
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			2	Comment	FC4.SP12.01	DP SP 12 Maintaining and Enhancing the Natural Environment	No	Positive Observations: FC4.SP17.01: Tourism policy changes support economic development appropriate for heritage locations FC4.SP12.01: Environmental protection measures support designated sites FC4.SP03.01: Social rented housing target address identified needs St Davids Parish would benefit from policies that balance heritage protection, rural sustainability and appropriate economic development.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.13. DP SP 13 Port and Energy Related Development and Celtic Freeport

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2603	Dewi Griffiths	DWR Cymru			1	Comment	FC4.SP13.02	DP SP 13 Port and Energy Related Development and Celtic Freeport		FC4.SP13.02 *Modify the SP13 boundary to include additional land within RWE ownership Pembroke Power Station, to reflect and support emerging Celtic Freeport proposals.* • There is a 12" diameter abandoned watermain crossing the additional area identified in the focussed changes. In accordance with the Water Industry Act 1991, Dwr Cymru Welsh Water requires access to its apparatus at all times in order to carry out maintenance and repairs. Where there are water mains and/or sewers crossing sites then protection measures in respect of these assets will be required, usually in the form of an easement width or in some instances a diversion of the asset.	Pembroke		Comment noted. No change required.			The comment regarding the abandoned water main is noted. The policy SP 13 boundary defines an area within which the policy will apply rather than being an allocation. However, this matter will need to be taken into consideration should site-specific proposals for port and / or energy related developments come forward on this site.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4203	Mike Ings	Heneb			1	Comment	FC4.SP13.02	DP SP 13 Port and Energy Related Development and Celtic Freeport	Yes	Focussed Change to include additional land within RWE ownership at Pembroke Power Station. It is noted that environmental safeguards are already built into this policy and cites the natural environment and the built environment. **This area is also within the Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest: Milford Haven Waterway. This designation requires protection within the LDP.**	Pembroke					As noted in the representation, Policy SP 13 Port and Energy Related Development and Celtic Freeport includes requirements to protect the landscape, built and natural environment. Protection for historic environment is provided by Policy GN 28 Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment and includes reference to Registered Historic Landscapes. No further change is proposed.	No

6.14. DP SP 15 Safeguarding of existing Strategic Employment Sites

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4476	Lidl GB Ltd		4391	Carney Sweeney	1	Object	FC4.SP15.01	DP SP 15 Safeguarding of existing Strategic Employment Sites	No	See row below.	Pembroke Dock	S/EMP/096/00005		The amendment suggested is contrary to National Planning Policy and/or Guidance.			No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required

Representor Comment: FC4.SP15.01 and the text to allow for changes of use of land and buildings within the site boundaries of Strategic Employment Sites to non-employment uses, does not accord with Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, Feb 2024)
PPW does not require the demonstration of 'exceptional circumstances' in regards to allowing employment generating development that does not fall within traditional (Class B) employment use classes. The wording is not sufficiently flexible and fails to recognise the role of complimentary employment generating uses within the employment allocations.
PPW states:
5.4.1....
5.4.2.... Economic land uses include the traditional employment land uses....as well as uses such as retail, tourism and public services..... The WG seeks to maximise opportunities to strengthen the foundational economy, particularly the food, retail, tourism and care sectors....the planning system should be supportive of this aim..."
The representor considers that Policy SP15 wording, and specifically allocation of site ref.S/EMP/096/00005, should not seek the demonstration of 'exceptional circumstances' as this is discordant with PPW. The wording should recognise the definition of economic land uses in PPW and duly allow for the delivery of a wider range of economic uses. This should include employment generating retail use (Use Class A1) where appropriate. Policy SP15 should refer to 'appropriate circumstances' being demonstrated in line with other relevant prevailing national guidance and tests.

PCC Response why edit is not required: The quoted paragraphs from PPW edition 12 provide high level guidance regarding economic land uses, which as the representor correctly states include the traditional employment land uses (essentially those in use classes B1, B2 and B8) and also some other types of land use, including retail. There is more detailed guidance in relation to the various components of the economic land uses included in various parts of PPW. PCC's policy SP 15 seeks to safeguard the existing Strategic Employment Sites of the Plan area and these are sites where B1, B2, B8 and / or Sui Generis uses related closely to B-class uses, currently take place. At Deposit stage there was some support recorded for the approach being taken by the Council on employment land safeguarding, highlighting the need to ensure that there was an adequate provision of land for future employment purposes. Focussed Change FC4.SP15.01 has taken a component of what was already in reasoned justification paragraph 4.93 policy SP 15 and placed it in the main policy text. It is the Council's view that it is entirely appropriate to safeguard the existing Strategic Employment Sites of the Plan area for ongoing employment use. The release of the identified sites for non-employment uses will only be permitted a) where closely related to the main employment use and b) in exceptional circumstances. That doesn't entirely close the door on the introduction in the future of non-employment uses (which might be other types of economic uses), but sends out a clear message that the primary purpose of these sites will be to provide land for B-class or closely related sui-generis uses in the future. That is entirely consistent with Welsh policy on this matter, as set out in PPW edition 12, paragraph 5.4.3, which states that: *'Planning authorities should support the provision of sufficient land to meet the needs of the employment market at both a strategic and local level. Development plans should identify employment land requirements, allocate an appropriate mix of sites to meet need and provide a framework for the protection of existing employment sites of strategic and local importance'*.

6.15. DP SP 17 Visitor Economy

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	4	Support	FC4.SP17.01	DP SP 17 Visitor Economy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses change FC4.SP17.01, which reflects its previous representation.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	4	Support	FC4.SP17.01	DP SP 17 Visitor Economy	Yes	Haven Leisure Limited endorses FC4.SP17.01 which addresses concerns highlighted in previous representations.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			5	Support	FC4.SP17.01	DP SP 17 Visitor Economy	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			3	Comment	FC4.SP17.01	DP SP 17 Visitor Economy	No	Positive Observations: FC4.SP17.01: Tourism policy changes support economic development appropriate for heritage locations FC4.SP12.01: Environmental protection measures support designated sites FC4.SP03.01: Social rented housing target address identified needs St Davids Parish would benefit from policies that balance heritage protection, rural sustainability and appropriate economic development.						It appears that the City Council is supportive of these Focussed Changes.	No

6.16. DP GN 1 General Development Policy

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2841	Melanie Lindsley	The Coal Authority			1	Support	FC5.GN01.05	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Support the added reference to land instability under Policy GN.1, criterion 8.			Support welcome. No change required.				No
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	3	Support	FC5.GN01.02	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Pembrokeshire Living Limited acknowledge that FC5.GN01.02 and FC5.GN01.03 appropriately address concerns highlighted in previous representations.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	4	Support	FC5.GN01.03	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Pembrokeshire Living Limited acknowledge that FC5.GN01.02 and FC5.GN01.03 appropriately address concerns highlighted in previous representations.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	5	Comment	FC5.GN01.01	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. We note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, PRL Partnership make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. PRL Partnership makes no objection to the proposed changes. PRL Partnership note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			The representor has commented: *'We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments'*. PCC confirms that this is an accurate treatment of the changes, which will be reflected in the re-wording of criterion 6. For clarification, aspects of criterion 6 are modified through Focussed Changes FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02 and FC5.GN01.04 and the revised version of criterion 6 will incorporate the changed elements drawn from each.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	6	Comment	FC5.GN01.02	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. We note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, PRL Partnership make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. PRL Partnership makes no objection to the proposed changes. PRL Partnership note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			The representor has commented: 'PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to ... FC5.GN01.02 ... which reflects its previous representation'. For clarification, aspects of criterion 6 are modified through Focussed Changes FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02 and FC5.GN01.04 and the revised version of criterion 6 will incorporate the changed elements drawn from each.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	7	Comment	FC5.GN01.03	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. We note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, PRL Partnership make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. PRL Partnership makes no objection to the proposed changes. PRL Partnership note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.03. This change splits and modifies the wording of criterion 2 of GN 1 (with the effect of creating separate criteria 2A and 2B).	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	8	Comment	FC5.GN01.04	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. We note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, PRL Partnership make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. PRL Partnership makes no objection to the proposed changes. PRL Partnership note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Agree minor change needed.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.04. This change modifies criterion 6 of GN 1 and also reasoned justification paragraph 5.7 by inserting additional text relating to level crossings. It is noted that there is a minor typo' in FC5.GN01.04 and that the word 'include' should be deleted.	Yes

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	9	Comment	FC5.GN01.05	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. We note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, PRL Partnership make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. PRL Partnership makes no objection to the proposed changes. PRL Partnership note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.05. This change modifies criterion 8 of GN 1. However, it is noted that the text of the representation does not specifically refer to this particular Focussed Change.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	10	Comment	FC5.GN01.06	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. We note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, PRL Partnership make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. PRL Partnership makes no objection to the proposed changes. PRL Partnership note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.06. This change modifies criterion 4 of GN 1 by inserting additional text relating to best and most versatile agricultural land, together with a new footnote (and to note there are also some deletions of text included).	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	11	Comment	FC5.GN01.07	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. We note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, PRL Partnership make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. PRL Partnership makes no objection to the proposed changes. PRL Partnership note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation comments that the link to the Peat Maps in FC5.GN01.07 did not work for them. Although the link in the Focussed Changes document is the correct one, once PCC became aware of the issue for the representor, it re-sent the link to the agents for the representor by email and provided them with an opportunity to review their response. This approach was successful and the agents were able to view the Peat Mapping with their client and have advised that: 'We have discussed the matter with our client and the Peat deposits shown on the mapping lie outside of our client's owned land and therefore, we do not intend to make comments on the Focused Changes. Thank you for giving them the opportunity'.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	5	Comment	FC5.GN01.01	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Haven endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. Haven note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. Haven makes no objection to the proposed changes to the supporting text. Haven note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			The representor has commented: *'We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments'*. PCC confirms that this is an accurate treatment of the changes, which will be reflected in the re-wording of criterion 6. For clarification, aspects of criterion 6 are modified through Focussed Changes FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02 and FC5.GN01.04 and the revised version of criterion 6 will incorporate the changed elements drawn from each.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	6	Comment	FC5.GN01.02	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Haven endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. Haven note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. Haven makes no objection to the proposed changes to the supporting text. Haven note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			The representor has commented: *'PRL Partnership endorses the proposed changes made in relation to ... FC5.GN01.02 ... which reflects its previous representation'*. For clarification, aspects of criterion 6 are modified through Focussed Changes FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02 and FC5.GN01.04 and the revised version of criterion 6 will incorporate the changed elements drawn from each.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	7	Comment	FC5.GN01.03	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Haven endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. Haven note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. Haven makes no objection to the proposed changes to the supporting text. Haven note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.03. This change splits and modifies the wording of criterion 2 of GN 1 (with the effect of creating separate criteria 2A and 2B).	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	8	Comment	FC5.GN01.04	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Haven endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. Haven note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. Haven makes no objection to the proposed changes to the supporting text. Haven note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Agree minor change needed.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.04. This change modifies criterion 6 of GN 1 and also reasoned justification paragraph 5.7 by inserting additional text relating to level crossings. It is noted that there is a minor typo' in FC5.GN01.04 and that the word 'include' should be deleted.	Yes

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	9	Comment	FC5.GN01.05	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Haven endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. Haven note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. Haven makes no objection to the proposed changes to the supporting text. Haven note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.05. This change modifies criterion 8 of GN 1. However, it is noted that the text of the representation does not specifically refer to this particular Focussed Change.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	10	Comment	FC5.GN01.06	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Haven endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. Haven note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. Haven makes no objection to the proposed changes to the supporting text. Haven note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation is essentially supportive of Focussed Change FC5.GN01.06. This change modifies criterion 4 of GN 1 by inserting additional text relating to best and most versatile agricultural land, together with a new footnote (and to note there are also some deletions of text included).	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	11	Comment	FC5.GN01.07	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Haven endorses the proposed changes made in relation to FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.03, FC5.GN01.06, which reflects its previous representation. Haven note that there is a potential risk of the proposed revise wording of criterion 6 being incorrectly transferred when combining two of the changes proposed. We understand that FC5.GN01.01 relates to locational accessibility, while FC5.GN01.04 relates to the addition of railway crossing matters. We have therefore treated the two parts separately. Assuming this is accurate, Haven make no further comments. As an aside, the representor has suggested a tidy up of wording to criterion 6. Haven makes no objection to the proposed changes to the supporting text. Haven note that the link in relation to Peat Maps proposed at FC5.GN01.07 is not working for us to review the implications of the change.			Comment noted. No change required.			This representation comments that the link to the Peat Maps in FC5.GN01.07 did not work for them. Although the link in the Focussed Changes document is the correct one, once PCC became aware of the issue for the representor, it re-sent the link to the agents for the representor by email and provided them with an opportunity to review their response. This approach was successful and the agents were able to view the Peat Mapping with their client and have advised that: 'We have discussed the matter with our client and the Peat deposits shown on the mapping lie outside of our client's owned land and therefore, we do not intend to make comments on the Focused Changes. Thank you for giving them the opportunity'.	No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			6	Support	FC5.GN01.02	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			4	Comment	FC5.GN01.01	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	No	CONCERNS: Development Control Changes (FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.06, FC5.GN13.02) Several changes appear to alter development control mechanisms: Removal of "capacity" considerations and qualification of accessibility requirements (FC5.GN01.01) Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06) Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06) For heritage locations like St Davids and rural parishes, these changes may impact the balance between development needs and environmental/heritage protection. Suggested consideration: Review whether these changes maintain appropriate protection for heritage and rural areas whilst achieving development objectives.			Comment noted. No change required.			The comment regarding FC5.GN01.01 is noted and the Focussed Change was made to better reflect Welsh Planning Policy.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			5	Comment	FC5.GN01.02	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	No	CONCERNS: Development Control Changes (FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.06, FC5.GN13.02) Several changes appear to alter development control mechanisms:Removal of "capacity" considerations and qualification of accessibility requirements (FC5.GN01.01)Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06)Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06)For heritage locations like St Davids and rural parishes, these changes may impact the balance between development needs and environmental/heritage protection.Suggested consideration: Review whether these changes maintain appropriate protection for heritage and rural areas whilst achieving development objectives.			Comment noted. No change required.			The comment regarding FC5.GN01.02 is noted and the Focussed Change was made to ensure that references to mitigation were included in the text.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			6	Comment	FC5.GN01.06	DP GN 1 General Development Policy	No	CONCERNS: Development Control Changes (FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.06, FC5.GN13.02) Several changes appear to alter development control mechanisms: Removal of "capacity" considerations and qualification of accessibility requirements (FC5.GN01.01) Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06) Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06) For heritage locations like St Davids and rural parishes, these changes may impact the balance between development needs and environmental/heritage protection. Suggested consideration: Review whether these changes maintain appropriate protection for heritage and rural areas whilst achieving development objectives.			Comment noted. No change required.			The comment regarding FC5.GN01.06 is noted and the Focussed Change was made to better reflect Welsh Planning Policy on agricultural land classification and best and most versatile agricultural land.	No

6.17. DP GN 2 Sustainable Design and Placemaking

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation	Support or Object	Focussed Change	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	5	Object	FC5.GN02.02	DP GN 2 Sustainable Design and Placemaking	No	See row below.			Agree Matters Arising Change needed.			Focussed Change FC5.GN02.02 refers to the insertion of additional text into GN 02 on embedding circular economy principles. The principle of inserting text to refer to this concept does not seem to be a matter to which the representor objects. However, there is a suggestion that it should be caveated to better align with PPW edition 12, which encourages adoption of circular economy principles where possible. The Council accepts that a further modification to the wording in relation to the circular economy by adding the words 'where possible' after 'circular economy principles' - and will support such a change at Examination. The reference in GN 02 to 'local and sustainable construction materials' is not a matter that has been modified by a Focussed Change and as such is an element of the policy to which the representor objected at Deposit stage, but which was not subsequently amended by the Council. Notwithstanding that matter, on reflection the reference to local and sustainable construction materials might not be deliverable and at Examination the Council would support its modification to 'the use of local construction materials where they are available and their use is economically viable and environmentally acceptable'.	Yes

Representor Comment: Pembrokeshire Living Limited has concerns regarding the proposed modification of Criterion 3 which makes explicit reference to embedding circular economy principles. PPW does not have the same restrictions. It refers to the Circular Economy and encourages the adoption of these principles as part of policies and development management decisions where it is possible (from paragraph 5.11).

Pembrokeshire Living Limited maintains concern in relation to the ongoing reference in FC.GN02.02 to the use of 'local and sustainable construction materials'. Aside from paragraph 5.23, no further guidance is provided to explain how this requirement will be applied at development management stage. Restricting materials to the local area is likely to be unsustainable in practice, and this approach is not support by PPW nor justified by the evidence base.

Suggested changes:
If criterion 3 is to continue to include reference to the circular economy
• Reference to 'local and sustainable construction materials' is removed, or wording added to say that such materials are 'explored where possible' and
The new criterion requires development proposals to 'explore opportunities to apply circular economy principles where possible on a project-by-project basis', ensuring flexibility and alignment with national policy.

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4480	Welsh Government		4394	Lichfields	1	Object	FC5.GN02.02	DP GN 2 Sustainable Design and Placemaking	No	See row below.			Agree Matters Arising Change needed.			Focussed Change FC5.GN02.02 refers to the insertion of additional text into GN 02 on embedding circular economy principles. That in itself does not seem to be a matter to which the representor objects, but in response to another representation the Council has accepted that the reference to circular economy principles needs to be caveated with the insertion of the words 'where possible', to better align with PPW edition 12 - and will support such a change at Examination. The reference in GN 02 to 'local and sustainable construction materials' is not a matter that has been modified by a Focussed Change and as such is an element of the policy to which the representor objected at Deposit stage, but which was not subsequently amended by the Council. Notwithstanding that matter, on reflection the reference to local and sustainable construction materials might not be deliverable and at Examination the Council would support its modification to 'the use of local construction materials where they are available and their use is economically viable and environmentally acceptable'.	Yes

The representor does not consider that this Focused Change has adequately addressed the concerns of previous representation. In particular, the policy still fails to provide any guidance in respect of the use of "local and sustainable construction materials". Maintain the previous concern:
1. Limiting the source location of materials to the local area is likely to be unsustainable in itself and is not justified in the supporting text or evidence base.
2. Reference to "local and sustainable construction materials" is neither precise nor measurable.

Given that the reference is now made to the circular economy, the representor no longer considers it necessary to include reference to the use of "local and sustainable construction materials" as drafted. Furthermore, any such reference should be acknowledged as being undertaken on a project-by-project basis, subject to viability.

Conflict between this policy requirement and current requirements in respect of Subsidy Control (State Aid). Placing a requirement that construction materials should be sourced from within the (undefined) local area has the potential to distort competition at a regional and/or national level, putting some suppliers at an unfair advantage. This could give rise to questions as to whether the Council's action (a public body) in this regards amounts to a financial Subsidy to Local Firms and falls foul of UK Subsidy Control Regulation.

6.18. DP GN 6 Development Proposals in Pre-Assessed Areas for Wind Energy (as set out in Future Wales)

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
1507	Welsh Government				1	Comment	FC5.GN06.01	DP GN 6 Development Proposals in Pre-Assessed Areas for Wind Energy (as set out in Future Wales)		The reference in the last sentence of the proposed additional paragraph 5.55a: The last sentence states: "If peat is identified within a proposed development it will be necessary to refuse permission unless other significant material considerations indicate otherwise." I take it this comes from PPW12, paragraph 6.4.34? For clarity does pre-assessed wind area 8 Include any element of land within Pembrokeshire? If it does, is any part of this area recognised as containing peat which this sentence could apply to? If so, my question is how does this last sentence relate to the pre-assessed areas and not inhibiting wind energy generation? Does the fact that the pre-assessed areas are set out in Future Wales, part of the development plan, provide the significant material consideration exception? If the answer is there is no correlation, there would be no issue. Seeking clarity to ensure this sentence does not preclude wind energy in a pre-assessed area coming forward.			Agree Matters Arising Change needed.			According to the Peatland of Wales mapping 0.5 Ha of peat is present in the western extermity of the Pre-assessed wind area within PCC's planning jursidiction. For context the Pre-assessed wind area covers 4980 Ha in PCC's LPA. In practice it will be possible for developers to avoid this small area of peatland when bringing forward wind turbine applications.The wording of the Focssued Changed should be altered to reflect these concerns. FC5.GN06.01 In this focssed change the line *"If peat is identified within a proposed development it will be necessary to refuse permission unless other significant material considerations indicate otherwise."* should be replaced with "*It will be necesary for proposals to avoid areas of peatland in line with the step-wise approach as laid out in paragraph 6.4.15 -1a in Planning Policy Wales edition 12.*"	Yes

6.19. DP GN 7 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4421	Matthew Ellis	Defence Infrastructure Organisation			1	Support	FC5.GN07.01	DP GN 7 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield		It is noted that the wording of Policy GN 7 and the supporting text has been modified in accordance with the changes suggested by MOD and that the requirement for a development brief for any future disposal of the site is now incorporated into the main wording of policy GN 7 which is fully supported.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4421	Matthew Ellis	Defence Infrastructure Organisation			2	Support	FC5.GN07.02	DP GN 7 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield		It is noted that the wording of Policy GN 7 and the supporting text has been modified in accordance with the changes suggested by MOD and that the requirement for a development brief for any future disposal of the site is now incorporated into the main wording of policy GN 7 which is fully supported.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4421	Matthew Ellis	Defence Infrastructure Organisation			3	Support	FC5.GN07.03	DP GN 7 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield		It is noted that the wording of Policy GN 7 and the supporting text has been modified in accordance with the changes suggested by MOD and that the requirement for a development brief for any future disposal of the site is now incorporated into the main wording of policy GN 7 which is fully supported.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4421	Matthew Ellis	Defence Infrastructure Organisation			4	Support	FC5.GN07.04	DP GN 7 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield		It is noted that the wording of Policy GN 7 and the supporting text has been modified in accordance with the changes suggested by MOD and that the requirement for a development brief for any future disposal of the site is now incorporated into the main wording of policy GN 7 which is fully supported.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4421	Matthew Ellis	Defence Infrastructure Organisation			5	Support	FC5.GN07.05	DP GN 7 Cawdor Barracks including the former Brawdy Airfield		It is noted that the wording of Policy GN 7 and the supporting text has been modified in accordance with the changes suggested by MOD and that the requirement for a development brief for any future disposal of the site is now incorporated into the main wording of policy GN 7 which is fully supported.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.20. DP GN 13 Residential Development

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	6	Support	FC5.GN13.02	DP GN 13 Residential Development	Yes	Pembrokeshire Living Limited is pleased to see that FC5.GN13.02 appropriately addresses concerns highlighted in previous representations.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			7	Support	FC5.GN13.02	DP GN 13 Residential Development	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			8	Support	FC5.GN13.02	DP GN 13 Residential Development	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation ...	Support or Object	Focussed Change	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			7	Comment	FC5.GN13.02	DP GN 13 Residential Development	No	CONCERNS: Development Control Changes (FC5.GN01.01, FC5.GN01.02, FC5.GN01.06, FC5.GN13.02) Several changes appear to alter development control mechanisms: Removal of "capacity" considerations and qualification of accessibility requirements (FC5.GN01.01) Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06) Removal of agricultural land survey requirements for larger sites outside settlement boundaries (FC5.GN01.06) For heritage locations like St Davids and rural parishes, these changes may impact the balance between development needs and environmental/heritage protection. Suggested consideration: Review whether these changes maintain appropriate protection for heritage and rural areas whilst achieving development objectives.						Comment noted. The Focussed Change relates to the clarifying where in principle residential can take place. Issues regading heritage will be considered under other policies of the Plan namely GN 28 Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment. The spatial strategy, strategic policies relating to settlement boundaries and policies locating where growth should happen are the primary drivers for deciding what happens in a rural context including for countryside locations.	No

6.21. DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4377	Jonathan Cole	ATEB Group Ltd	4376	Stantec	4	Support	FC5.GN15.01	DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards	Yes	See row below.	Letterston	HSG/053/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

DP Glossary
Support for replacing the description of Affordable Housing to reflect TAN 2. (FC1.Context.01)
DP1 Context and Issues
Support for the replacement of references to NVZs in Wales with updated text (FC1.Context.03)
DP SP3 Affordable Housing Targets DP
Comments recognise that the proposed change to include a table indentifying the tenured split for affordable housing delivery and showing the over housing need should increase the range of affordable housing that can be delivered and ensure the majority of provision is for those most in need. (FC4.SP03.01)
DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards
Support the amendments refering the latest published evidence and the included reference 'or equivalent' in relation to the approach to Lifetime Homes Standards under Policy GN.15.
DP GN 16 Residential Allocations
DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing
The representor takes issue with how well GN 20 expands upon the calculations of the commuted sum considered necessary. The Affordable Housing SPG provides commuted sum calculations for corresponding affordable housing requirements but from the point of 5% upwards, with no sum equivalent provided for those areas where 0% is the target affordable housing. They suggest simplifying the structure of the policy and commit to robust monitoring and review processes, and simplify a way of calculating the commuted sums.

4377	Jonathan Cole	ATEB Group Ltd	4376	Stantec	5	Support	FC5.GN15.03	DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards	Yes	See row below.	Letterston	HSG/053/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
DP GlossarySupport for replacing the description of Affordable Housing to reflect TAN 2. (FC1.Context.01) DP1 Context and Issues Support for the replacement of references to NVZs in Wales with updated text (FC1.Context.03)DP SP3 Affordable Housing Targets DP Comments recognise that the proposed change to include a table indentifying the tenured split for affordable housing delivery and showing the over housing need should increase the range of affordable housing that can be delivered and ensure the majority of provision is for those most in need. (FC4.SP03.01)DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards Support the amendments refering the latest published evidence and the included reference 'or equivalent' in relation to the approach to Lifetime Homes Standards under Policy GN.15. DP GN 16 Residential AllocationsDP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing The representor takes issue with how well GN 20 expands upon the calculations of the commuted sum considered necessary. The Affordable Housing SPG provides commuted sum calculations for corresponding affordable housing requirements but from the point of 5% upwards, with no sum equivalent provided for those areas where 0% is the target affordable housing. They suggest simplifying the structure of the policy and commit to robust monitoring and review processes, and simplify a way of calculating the commuted sums.																
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	7	Object	FC5.GN15.03	DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards	No	Pembrokeshire Living Limited welcomes changes proposed at FC5.GN15.03 specifically: • The addition of 'or equivalent' alongside Lifetime Homes Standards; and • The removal of reference to the England-prescribed space standards. The remainder of Pembrokeshire Living Limited's earlier representations remain for the Inspector's consideration.					The Focussed Change is supported. The objection to the Deposit Plan remain's for consideration by the Inspector		No
4480	Welsh Government		4394	Lichfields	2	Object	FC5.GN15.01	DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards	No	See row below.						The Council's response to the representor's Deposit Representations is set out in SD09 Consultation Report Appendix 4 Issues Paper https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission Section 4.9 in particular paragraphs 2 and 3. To note the Council has not proposed a Focussed Change to Criterion B. This representation i**s not therefore duly made**.	No
The representors note that some changes have been made to the supporting text to Policy GN15 but are concerned that no changes have been made to Criteria B or C in accordance with the comments set out in our previous representations. 1. Criterion B of the policy seeks an "appropriate mix" of housing types, tenures and sizes but does not provide any basis by which such an "appropriate mix" might be identified and controlled. The supporting text refers to the LHMA but the lack of reference to this in the policy itself limits the extent to which the Council might be able to ensure compliance. Furthermore, restricting any consideration of housing mix to the LHMA (prepared in 2021) would also base it at a point in time and so may not reflect the prevailing conditions at the time of determination of a planning application. As presently drafted, Criterion C appears to seek a mix of residential use types e.g secondary and short-term as part of any residential development. The representor considers that this criterion would benefit from redrafting to ensure greater clarity to control short term lets and second homes and define what is meant by 'appropriate mix'.																

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4480	Welsh Government		4394	Lichfields	3	Object	FC5.GN15.02	DP GN 15 Housing Mix, Second Homes and Short-term Holiday Lets, Space Standards and Requirements for Lifetime Homes Standards	No	See Row below						The Council's response to Deposit Representations is set out in SD09 Consultation Report Appendix 4 Issues Paper https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission Section 4.9 in particular pargraph 15. To note the Council has not proposed a Focussed Change to Criterion C.**This representation is not therefore duly made.**	No
The representors note that some changes have been made to the supporting text to Policy GN15 but are concerned that no changes have been made to Criteria B or C in accordance with the comments set out in our previous representations. 1. Criterion B of the policy seeks an "appropriate mix" of housing types, tenures and sizes but does not provide any basis by which such an "appropriate mix" might be identified and controlled. The supporting text refers to the LHMA but the lack of reference to this in the policy itself limits the extent to which the Council might be able to ensure compliance. Furthermore, restricting any consideration of housing mix to the LHMA (prepared in 2021) would also base it at a point in time and so may not reflect the prevailing conditions at the time of determination of a planning application. As presently drafted, Criterion C appears to seek a mix of residential use types e.g secondary and short-term as part of any residential development. The representor considers that this criterion would benefit from redrafting to ensure greater clarity to control short term lets and second homes and define what is meant by 'appropriate mix'.																

6.22. DP GN 16 Residential Allocations

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2242	Mr & Mrs V Rogers				2	Object	FC5.GN16. Jeffreyston.01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	No	Representor repeats their previous comments regarding the allocation of Site 524 Land front B4586 (HSG/047/LDP2/1 Land south of the Crown) The village does not have the infrastructure for the housing development - no shops, public transport. The development would cause more traffic on already busy narrow roads, heavily used by farm machinery. The local school is full. There is wildlife on site that would be severley impacted by the development. The LDP Issue Report references two trees in the hedgerow fronting the B4586 having Ash Dieback. Only one tree has this. The ash and sycamore opposite High Croft and Casa-mia properties are healthy. The site is prone to flooding and has a stream running through it. There are mine workings on site. There are no main sewers in the village. Site 375 (allocated in LDP1) would be sufficient to meet future housing needs.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/2				Please see response to representation 2242/1.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2242	Mr & Mrs V Rogers				2	Object	FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.02	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	No	Representor repeats their previous comments regarding the allocation of Site 524 Land front B4586 (HSG/047/LDP2/1 Land south of the Crown) The village does not have the infrastructure for the housing development - no shops, public transport. The development would cause more traffic on already busy narrow roads, heavily used by farm machinery. The local school is full. There is wildlife on site that would be severley impacted by the development. The LDP Issue Report references two trees in the hedgerow fronting the B4586 having Ash Dieback. Only one tree has this. The ash and sycamore opposite High Croft and Casa-mia properties are healthy. The site is prone to flooding and has a stream running through it. There are mine workings on site. There are no main sewers in the village. Site 375 (allocated in LDP1) would be sufficient to meet future housing needs.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/3				Please see response to representation 2242/1.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2603	Dewi Griffiths	DWR Cymru			2	Comment	FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.02	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.02 Amend the size of HSG/047/LDP2/1 to 0.79ha; change the number of units in the Plan period from 8 to 10. • There is a 100mm diameter watermain crossing the additional area identified in the focussed changes. In accordance with the Water Industry Act 1991, Dwr Cymru Welsh Water requires access to its apparatus at all times in order to carry out maintenance and repairs. Where there are water mains and/or sewers crossing sites then protection measures in respect of these assets will be required, usually in the form of an easement width or in some instances a diversion of the asset.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				The presence of the water main running along the frontage of the site was acknowledged during the Deposit Plan consultation and is considered in the Issues Report for Jeffreyston, including the need for easement. No further change is needed. See Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report (Ref SD09). response. weblink to reference above: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission Section 4.10 Jeffryston. The information will be provided in the Council's planned Development Sites and infrastructure Supplementary Planning Guidance.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2603	Dewi Griffiths	DWR Cymru			3	Comment	FC5.GN16.Johnston.01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		FC5.GN16.Johnston.01 Increase the residential allocation HSG/048/00038 by 0.95HA. Increase units Beyond the Plan Period. • There is a 7" diameter sewer crossing the additional area identified in the focussed changes. In accordance with the Water Industry Act 1991, Dwr Cymru Welsh Water requires access to its apparatus at all times in order to carry out maintenance and repairs. Where there are water mains and/or sewers crossing sites then protection measures in respect of these assets will be required, usually in the form of an easement width or in some instances a diversion of the asset.	Johnston	HSG/048/00038	Comment noted. No change required.			The comment regarding the sewer crossing the additional area of land identified by the Focussed Change is noted. This matter will be referenced in the Development Sites and Infrastructure SPG and will need to be taken into consideration at planning application stage.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2603	Dewi Griffiths	DWR Cymru			4	Comment	FC5.GN16.PembrokeDock.02	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		FC5.GN16.PembrokeDock.02 Add the southern part of candidate site of 074 (Land at Upper Sycamore Woods) to the allocation list under policy GN 16 Housing Allocations. • There are no water or sewerage assets crossing the site, although some public sewers and lateral drains may not be recorded on our maps of public sewers because they were originally privately owned and were transferred into public ownership by nature of the Water Industry (Schemes for Adoption of Private Sewers) Regulations 2011. A point of connection to the sewerage and water networks will need to be agreed at the time of a planning application. The site lies within the catchment area of Pembroke Dock Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed development site.	Pembroke Dock	HSG/096/LDP2/3	Comment noted. No change required.			The comments regarding the absence of recorded water or sewerage assets crossing the site and the need for a point of connection to be agreed at the time of a planning applications are noted. This matter will be referenced in the Development Sites and Infrastructure SPG.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4083	David Ambrose				1	Object	Not Applicable	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	No	The Southern portion of Candidate Site 298 (HSG/066/LDP2/1 Land East of Hazelbank) should be reclassified from residential Green 4 to Pink 2A, as is the status of the north portion. This is due to the impacts of additional traffic on residents in Hazelbank, the substandard of the highway and the consequences any highway improvement works would have on properties and residents, the need for substantial service upgrades and the impact of construction works on wildlife.	Llanstadwell	HSG/066/LDP2/1				The representation is unfortunately **not duly made** as it does not relate to a proposed Focussed Change of Local Development Plan 2 Deposit 2 and therefore officers have not considered this representation further. However, it is useful to be aware that the appropriateness of the site's suitability for allocation was objected to at Deposit Stage by others and therefore will be before the Inspector for consideration.	No
4288	J Mills & R Ariss				2	Object	FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	Yes	An objection to HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) due to concerns regarding the busy highway, frequented by tractors and trailers, and the inability of the school to accommodate any more students. Development of HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) would disrupt lives and businesses. The smaller site identified would be a much better location to focus development, and would cause minimal disruption.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				Please see response to representation 4288/1.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4288	J Mills & R Ariss				3	Object	FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.02	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	Yes	An objection to HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) due to concerns regarding the busy highway, frequented by tractors and trailers, and the inability of the school to accommodate any more students. Development of HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) would disrupt lives and businesses. The smaller site identified would be a much better location to focus development, and would cause minimal disruption.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				Please see response to representation 4288/1.	No
4288	J Mills & R Ariss				5	Object	OE18 Candidate Site Register	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	No	An objection to HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) due to concerns regarding the busy highway, frequented by tractors and trailers, and the inability of the school to accommodate any more students. Development of HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) would disrupt lives and businesses. The smaller site identified would be a much better location to focus development, and would cause minimal disruption.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				Please see response to representation 4288/1.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4375	Mr M & J Morrillo		1966	Evans Banks Planning Ltd	2	Object	FC5.GN16.HillMountain.01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	No	See row below.	Hill Mountain	HSG/043/LDP2/1		The housing provision is set out in detail in the Plan to respond to the Plan's housing requirement and it is considered to be sufficient without the need to consider further housing sites.		See row below.	No

Representor comment: The representor supports the inclusion of additional land proposed in settlement boundary, but object to the proposed omission of the element previous includes as part of the proposals in the Deposit 2 document. The rationale for the changes made to allocation HSG/043/LDP2/1 Adjacent to Brackenhurst is not entirely clear. Through the 'net' increase in the allocation's area, the Council are anticipating that the allocation will deliver 30 units. However, when the amended Settlement Boundary is plotted on the previously submitted site layout, the ability to achieve these numbers in an appropriate manner is questioned.
The reduction in the allocation's depth would create a much denser form of development with the 30 units required, which may not result in a 'better layout for the settlement'.

PCC response: For the reasons previously set out in the Deposit 2 stage, the Plan will not deliver the required level of new housing during the Plan Period, and the Focussed Changes discussed herein will not change this outcome.

At Deposit stage, the representor objected to the residential allocation at Hill Mountain, suggesting an alternative site area. The allocation of the Deposit Plan was an amalgam of parts of a variety of Candidate Sites submitted by the representor. The Deposit stage objection proposed a much larger allocation with different boundaries, albeit in the same general area of the village. In assessing the Deposit stage representation, the Council concluded that using all of the land area suggested by the representor for the residential allocation would provide a disproportionate level of growth when compared to the size of village and result in a poor layout at the western end of the site. However, it was also accepted that the allocation boundaries could be amended in a manner that would allow a better internal layout for the site which would also provide an appropriate scale of future growth and a better spatial fit for the settlement as a whole. In so doing, the spatial extent of the allocation was modified and there was a net gain of 0.19 hectares, equating to four additional dwellings to be added to the total to be delivered beyond the Plan period. The representor has indicated support for the inclusion of additional land overall, but would wish to see reinstated the element of the Deposit stage allocation which was removed. The Council is of the view that to do this would undermine the purpose of re-configuring the residential allocation and would provide a disproportionate scale of growth for a village of this size and result in a poorer layout. Hence, no further modification to the allocation is proposed in advance of Examination. In terms of the density of development proposed, the revised site area following the Focussed Change is 1.35 hectares, with 30 dwellings proposed in total (15 in the Plan period and a further 15 beyond the Plan period). That equates to a density of just under the 23 dph envisaged by policy GN 13.

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4467	Pauline & Neil Clarke				1	Object	Not Applicable	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		Candidate Site 298 (HSG/066/LDP2/1 Land East of Hazelbank) should not be carried forward as an allocation. Driveways could be blocked by construction work and traffic, impeding residents access into properties. There is lots of on-road parking which congests the highway. There is insufficient parking, including what is available on the road, for residents and there is often overspill to HAzelbank Hill. The highway, which is single track with limited passing places, is in close proximity to the community play park and users using Hazelbank for parking. As it is, pedestrians are not safe as there are no pavements. Construction traffic from the proposed development would exacerbate all of this. There is additional concerns regarding the existing infrastructure capabilities of coping with increased requirement for parking, drainage, waste and water supply etc. Representor has provided pictures.	Llanstadwell	HSG/066/LDP2/1				The representation is unfortunately **not duly made** as it does not relate to a proposed Focussed Change of Local Development Plan 2 Deposit 2 and therefore officers have not considered this representation further. However, it is useful to be aware that the appropriateness of the site's suitability for allocation was objected to at Deposit Stage by others (including one of these representors) and therefore will be before the Inspector for consideration.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4470	Mr & Mrs P Sherwood				2	Object	FC5.GN16 Jeffreyston.01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		The representor objects to the proposed development at HSG/047/LDP2/1 due to the lack of sewerage, lack of services, the school being at maximum capacity, marshy ground with drainage issues. The land is ecologically important. The site is not served by footways and the roads are heavily trafficked, make it unsafe for pedestrians. The site has known coal workings, which has been raised by the Coal Authority. The Council previously came to the view during an earlier consultation on candidate sites that the land wasn't needed to meet the level of growth required - what has changed? The representor has family living opposite the proposed development and it will impact them severely.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/2				Please see response to representation 4470/1	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4470	Mr & Mrs P Sherwood				3	Object	FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.02	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations		The representor objects to the proposed development at HSG/047/LDP2/1 due to the lack of sewerage, lack of services, the school being at maximum capacity, marshy ground with drainage issues. The land is ecologically important. The site is not served by footways and the roads are heavily trafficked, make it unsafe for pedestrians. The site has known coal workings, which has been raised by the Coal Authority. The Council previously came to the view during an earlier consultation on candidate sites that the land wasn't needed to meet the level of growth required - what has changed? The representor has family living opposite the proposed development and it will impact them severely.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/3				Please see response to representation 4470/1	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4472	Celtic Homes Ltd		1955	Boyer Planning	2	Support	FC5.GN16.PembrokeDock.02	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	Yes	See Row below	Pembroke Dock	HSG/096/LDP2/3	Support welcomed. No change required.				No
Land at Upper Sycamore Woods, Pembroke Dock (formerly Candidate Site 074) now HSG/096/LDP2/3 - focussed change FC5.GN16.PembrokeDock.02 We welcome the focussed changes, which confirm the site's allocation for residential development (HSG/096/LDP2/3) and removal of the previous open space designation. Earlier representations raised concerns regarding the plan period (2017-2033) and whilst the Focussed Changes do not alter the plan period, the inclusion of the site as a new housing allocation helps mitigate some of the risks associated with the compressed Plan timeframe. Allocating HSG/096/LDP2/3 increases the Council's short term deliverable supply, reducing reliance on long-term allocations. **FC5.GN16.PembrokeDock.02 -** Fully support the focused change to allocate Upper Sycamore Woods for residential development. The Deposit 2 allocations for Pembroke Dock were heavily weighted towards the medium and long term. This imbalance failed to reflect the settlement's position in the hierarchy and its role as part of the Regional Growth Area. It also risked leaving a gap in the housing trajectory, undermining delivery in the early years of the Plan. Introducing the site as a short-to-medium term deliverable allocation, this FC addresses the above concerns.																
4474	Ian Evans		4277	JCR Planning Ltd	1	Support	FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	Yes	The proposed adjustment to the site will increase the viability of the allocation and is welcomed.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4474	Ian Evans				3	Support	FC5.GN16.Jeffreyston.02	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	Yes	See representation 4474/1	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4480	Welsh Government		4394	Lichfields	4	Object	FC5.GN16.Haverfordwest01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	No	The representor objects to the affordable housing requirement of 50% at the Slade Lane site, citing that there is no evidence to support this level of affordable housing provision. Slade Lane was not identified as one of the key sites listed in Appendix F of the viability assessment. Slade Lane is not comparable in size to any of the key sites or typologies that were considered by the viability assessment. The representor has provided a detailed representation, please see original representation. The representation is structured as follows: **Introduction to the objection.** **Viability Evidence** **Compliance with national policy position** **Public sector accountability** **Conclusion** Supporting viability documents were submitted to accompany this representation.	Haverfordwest & Merlins Bridge	S/HSG/040/LDP2/6 Slade Lane		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		See row below.	

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
The Council's position on this matter is set out in Appendix 4 to the Consultation Report on the Submission Website link: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission : See Section 4.8 - The representation records support for the removal of the Deposit Plan 2 affordable housing provision figure of 83% for the Slade Lane site. For the Focussed Changes consultation, this was replaced with a 50% figure and an explanation was provided as to why this figure had been chosen. It was also accepted that this would represent an interim position, pending the preparation of a key site viability appraisal for the Slade Lane housing allocation. PCC used the best available information at the time of preparation for the Focussed Changes affordable housing provision figures for phases 1 and 2 (as provided by the case officer) and applied a 50% rate for Welsh Government phase to follow this. The Welsh Government's contract notice abstract on Sell2Wales, to support the procurement of the Masterplan commission, from January 2024, makes reference to proposals ... 'including (but not limited to) 50% affordable across the site ... amongst other things, and while PCC accepts that Welsh Government has now changed its position on this matter, it was the most up to date position available to PCC when preparing the Deposit LDP 2 and also the Focussed Changes. It is important to reference two further matters at this stage. Firstly, as explained in the Issues Report, where PCC was anticipating 50% plus affordable housing delivery by an RSL / public body, it did not require a site-specific viability appraisal to be prepared (the existence of previous planning permissions relating to the site also being a consideration). Hence, a key site viability appraisal was not sought at Slade Lane. It is now clear that the site proposer is intending to provide less than 50% affordable housing on the Slade Lane site, hence one is now deemed to be needed. Secondly, the results from the high-level viability testing will not provide a basis for setting the affordable housing requirement for this large residential allocation - this must now come from a site-specific viability appraisal. To facilitate this, PCC has supplied the consultants for Welsh Government with the Viability Model and the consultants have now in turn supplied two completed versions for the Slade Lane site, one looking at a potential 30% affordable housing provision and the other a potential 25% affordable housing provision (with the conclusion presented by them being that only 25% would be viable). PCC has previously committed (in the Issues Report) to look at the viability at this site again, once a site-specific viability appraisal was to hand, and will honour that commitment. It will form a basis for a discussion at an Examination hearing and inform the level of affordable housing provision at the site for inclusion in the final version of LDP 2. In the interim, PCC will ask its viability consultant to review the two versions of the completed Viability Model supplied and provide advice back to the Council on this matter. One further issue to reference is the consultants' comments with regard to the UK subsidy control regime. The representation indicates that 'this action could also give rise to questions of PCC in respect of its policy advancing the profits of private organisations at the expense of Welsh public money'. PCC considers its role in setting affordable housing provision levels for residential allocations through the LDP as being regulatory and does not consider that it is providing subsidy / financial assistance to private organisations, as defined by the UK subsidy control regime. PCC's role is as the Local Planning Authority and specifically it is seeking to establish local planning policy for the area over which it has planning jurisdiction. As previously noted, the 50% affordable housing provision suggestion was in fact derived from information that Welsh Government provided, albeit its position on this matter has moved.																	

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			8	Comment	FC5.GN16.Haverfordwest.01	DP GN 16 Residential Allocations	No	OBSERVATIONS: Affordable Housing Delivery (FC5.GN20.01, FC5.GN16. Haverfordwest.01) Changes appear to affect affordable housing mechanisms: Removal of provisions to adjust contributions based on improved viability (FC5.GN20.01) Reduction in Slade Lane affordable housing provision from 83% to 50% (FC5.GN16. Haverfordwest.01) This may impact county-wide affordable housing delivery, potentially affecting rural communities where housing affordability is a particular challenge. Suggested consideration: Ensure these changes align with the plan's affordable housing objectives, particularly for rural communities.		S/HSG/040/LDP2/6 Slade Lane		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		Focussed Change FC5.GN16.Haverfordwest.01 reduces the affordable housing requirement for the Slade Lane, Haverfordwest, site. The derivation of the revised figure of 50% is based on the most up-to-date information available at the time regarding the provision of affordable housing to be made on phases 1 and 2 of the site (those being brought forward by Pobl Housing Association), together with the application of a 50% provision for the remaining land. Welsh Government, through its agents, does not accept the final figure and is preparing a viability appraisal for the whole site which will inform a further debate at Examination on what is considered to be viable. As a general comment, PCC is requiring a provision to be made for affordable housing in conjunction with all new housing development in its area of planning jurisdiction, with the appropriate levels being variously informed by site-specific viability appraisals for key sites and through the outcomes of the high level viability testing for other sites, as explained in more detail in policy GN 20. As GN 20 explains, this may take the form of on-site provision in some cases and a commuted sum in others. If PCC asks for levels of affordable housing provision that are not viable, the result will be no delivery. There is a detailed viability report to underpin PCC's conclusions on what is possible.	No

6.23. DP GN 19A Maesgwynne, Fishguard S/HSG/034F/LDP2/1

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4171	Diane Llewhelin				1	Object	FC5.GN19A.Maesgwynne.01	DP GN 19A Maesgwynne, Fishguard S/HSG/034F/LDP2/1		Our family object to the building of residential houses at Maesgwynne, Fishguard S/HSG/034F/LDP2/ on the field immediately in front of Maesgwynne Farm House. The built heritage and historic environment of this Grade II Listed Home must be respected and protected. Dyfed Archaeological Society and CADW see Maesgwynne as being integral to the local culture. "Considerate and considerable buffering is needed to maintain its view and enhance the historical aspect in order to protect this building. Although Maesgwynne Farm is outside the development area, because it has Listed Building status is may be considered that the development would have a detrimental effect upon the setting of the farm buildings...Guidance is sought from the Local Authority" - Dyfed Archaeological Trust. We would prefer none or a few houses to be bult there, but we have some acceptable for a projected Health Centre and/or Residential Home if sympathetically constructed and respectfully distanced from Maesgwynne Farm House.	Fishguard	S/HSG/034F/LDP2/1			PCC does agree that a buffer zone should be included around the Maesgwynne Farm complex and has made reference to the requirement for this in policy GN 19A. As the more general objection to the housing allocation is not duly made, PCC is not proposing to remove or modify the allocation in response to this representation. However, policy GN 19A already references issues raised as concerns and will expect these matters to be addressed by the anticipated site masterplan.	See row below.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
Two Focussed Changes have been put forward to policy GN 19A at Maesgwynne, Fishguard, relating to the insertion of additional text referring to the possibility of including residential care accommodation and or a health centre / clinic at the site and the potential need to incorporate references to this in the site masterplan, should their inclusion be accepted. An element of this representation relates to these Focussed Changes and records a degree of acceptance for their inclusion, subject to sympathetic construction and their location a respectful distance from Maesgwynne Farm House, which is a Listed Building. The other elements of this representation are a general objection to the residential allocation at Maesgwynne, Fishguard, which should have been submitted during the autumn 2024 public consultation. The reasons for the objetion reference the Grade II listed Maesgwynne Farm House and note that while the Farm House itself is outside the area of the allocation, development would have a detrimental effect on the setting of the farm buildings. Substantial buffering is advocated to protect the setting of the Listed Building. Whilst this further element of the representation **is not duly made**, as it doesn't relate to a Focussed Change, the issues that are raises are in fact already referenced in policy GN 19A, which amongst other things, suggests a buffer zone adjacent to the Maesgwynne Farm complex. As well as residential development, it also identifies a need for the Maesgwynne site to provide public and amenity open space, take account of areas protected for their nature conservation value and address matters relating to sustainable access. While the residential allocation is set out in policy GN 16, it is policy GN 19A which advocates preparation of a masterplan for the undeveloped parts of the site, with a view to this forming a basis for future planning applications and for LDP 2 Supplementary Planning Guidance. The masterplan would also refer to residential care accommodation and / or a health centre, if these further suggested uses are accepted. As the representor has made a Focussed Change representation, they are now registered on the database and will receive notification of Development Plan related consultations moving forward.																

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4171	Diane Llewhelin				1	Object	FC5.GN19A.Maesgwynne.02	DP GN 19A Maesgwynne, Fishguard S/HSG/034F/LDP2/1		Our family object to the building of residential houses at Maesgwynne, Fishguard S/HSG/034F/LDP2/ on the field immediately in front of Maesgwynne Farm House. The built heritage and historic environment of this Grade II Listed Home must be respected and protected. Dyfed Archaeological Society and CADW see Maesgwynne as being integral to the local culture. "Considerate and considerable buffering is needed to maintain its view and enhance the historical aspect in order to protect this building. Although Maesgwynne Farm is outside the development area, because it has Listed Building status is may be considered that the development would have a detrimental effect upon the setting of the farm buildings...Guidance is sought from the Local Authority" - Dyfed Archaeological Trust. We would prefer none or a few houses to be bult there, but we have some acceptable for a projected Health Centre and/or Residential Home if sympathetically constructed and respectfully distanced from Maesgwynne Farm House.	Fishguard	S/HSG/034F/LDP2/1			PCC does agree that a buffer zone should be included around the Maesgwynne Farm complex and has made reference to the requirement for this in policy GN 19A. As the more general objection to the housing allocation **is not duly made**, PCC is not proposing to remove or modify the allocation in response to this representation. However, policy GN 19A already references issues raised as concerns and will expect these matters to be addressed by the anticipated site masterplan.	See Row below.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
Two Focussed Changes have been put forward to policy GN 19A at Maesgwynne, Fishguard, relating to the insertion of additional text referring to the possibility of including residential care accommodation and or a health centre / clinic at the site and the potential need to incorporate references to this in the site masterplan, should their inclusion be accepted. An element of this representation relates to these Focussed Changes and records a degree of acceptance for their inclusion, subject to sympathetic construction and their location a respectful distance from Maesgwynne Farm House, which is a Listed Building. The other elements of this representation are a general objection to the residential allocation at Maesgwynne, Fishguard, which should have been submitted during the autumn 2024 public consultation. The reasons for the objection reference the Grade II listed Maesgwynne Farm House and note that while the Farm House itself is outside the area of the allocation, development would have a detrimental effect on the setting of the farm buildings. Substantial buffering is advocated to protect the setting of the Listed Building. Whilst this further element of the representation **is not duly made**, as it doesn't relate to a Focussed Change, the issues that are raises are in fact already referenced in policy GN 19A, which amongst other things, suggests a buffer zone adjacent to the Maesgwynne Farm complex. As well as residential development, it also identifies a need for the Maesgwynne site to provide public and amenity open space, takes account of areas protected for their nature conservation value and address matters relating to sustainable access. While the residential allocation is set out in policy GN 16, it is policy GN 19A which advocates preparation of a masterplan for the undeveloped parts of the site, with a view to this forming a basis for future planning applications and for LDP 2 Supplementary Planning Guidance. The masterplan would also refer to residential care accommodation and / or a health centre, if these further suggested uses are accepted.																

6.24. DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4475	L Greggain & Co Ltd		1693	Geraint John Planning	1	Object	FC5.GN20.03	DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing	No	S/HSG/86/LDP2/3 South of Conway Drive, Castle Pill Road, Steynton Objection to the continued allocation of the site (S/HSG.86/LDP2/3) for residential use on the following basis: • Highways and access capacity issues to service the strategic site; and • Lack of supporting infrastructure services to support the development of the site.	Milford Haven	S/HSG/86/LDP2/3				The objection relates to the allocation of the site for residential purposes and how the representor considers this allocation to be unsuitable. It does not relate to the identification of Steynton as being in Band 2 of the Housing Market Area on the Proposals Maps, which is the nature of the Focused Changes (FC5.GN20.03). Therefore, it is considered that the representation **is not duly made** as it does not relate to a proposed Focussed Change of Local Development Plan 2 Deposit 2 and therefore officers have not considered this representation further. The representor has submitted representations regarding this site at Deposit Stage.	No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			9	Support	FC5.GN20.02	DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34774	Simon Mann	St Davids City Council			9	Comment	FC5.GN20.01	DP GN 20 Local Needs Affordable Housing	No	OBSERVATIONS: Affordable Housing Delivery (FC5.GN20.01, FC5.GN16. Haverfordwest.01) Changes appear to affect affordable housing mechanisms: Removal of provisions to adjust contributions based on improved viability (FC5.GN20.01) Reduction in Slade Lane affordable housing provision from 83% to 50% (FC5.GN16. Haverfordwest.01) This may impact county-wide affordable housing delivery, potentially affecting rural communities where housing affordability is a particular challenge. Suggested consideration: Ensure these changes align with the plan's affordable housing objectives, particularly for rural communities.						Comments are noted. The rationale for Focussed Changes to Policy GN 20 are set out in https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission SD09 Consultation Report Appendix 4 Section 4.9. Paragraphs 16 to 21.	No

6.25. DP GN 21 Exception Sites for Local Needs Affordable Housing

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			10	Support	FC5.GN21.01	DP GN 21 Exception Sites for Local Needs Affordable Housing	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.26. DP GN 22 Specialist and Supported Accommodation

epresentor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	8	Object	FC5.GN22.03	DP GN 22 Specialist and Supported Accommodation	No	See row below.						The change proposed is in response to concerns raised by the Council's Strategic Comissioning Team who advised: *There is .. a risk that proposals are brought forward that are speculative, likely to increase net migration of older people into Pembrokeshire and not actually meet the identified need for existing residents and relatives of existing residents. This would put additional pressure on our current services. .....It is therefore suggested that a specific guidance note should be created to enable development of care homes and/or extra care housing other than in specifically identified sites: • Where they will meet local need, and are expressly supported by the social care department of the council.'*	No
Pembrokeshire Living Limited acknowledges GN 22 provides important and positive framework for the delivery of specialist and supported accommodation. Although FC5.GN22.03 does not explicitly refer to accommodation for older people, it is evident from the policy's support text that such accommodation is included within its scope. This approach is supported, as it ensures that proposals to meet the identified and growing need for older persons' accommodation are capture within the policy framework. The addition to paragraph 5.124 which confirms that the LPA will consult with housing, social and health services is endorsed. Pembrokeshire Living Limited has concerns relating specifically to the amendment that requires a local need for specialist or supported accommodation must be 'satisfactorily evidenced and support by the Council's Strategic Commissioning Team'. This requirement is considered overly onerous and unnecessary for the following reasons: • The Council's evidence base establishes a need for specialist and support accommodation. • Making it an obligation to receive support from the Strategic Commissioning Team seems onerous in light of the evidence already include with this policy. • It is not clear what the Council's Strategic Commissioning Team is, or what formal role it would play in the planning process. From the representor's review, it appears to be a group that already consults with the services which are addressed in the new supporting text at para. 5.124. Pembrokeshire Living Limited suggest that this requirement should not be framed as a policy criterion necessary for approval.																

6.27. DP GN 24 Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
1830	Mr W Jenkins	Priory Farm	3911	A C Crompton	3	Object	FC5.GN24.01	DP GN 24 Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations	No	Removal of Gypsy Site Allocation GT/095/LDP2/1 Castle Quarry Eastern Extension FC5.GN24.01 - Whilst the Council has reasoned that the removal of the site is due to 'representations received and updated information regarding deliverability and capacity issues', the landowner is not aware of any 'representations' submitted by third parties/members of the public during consultation stages. It is therefore ironic that the Council's Estate team have been in negotiations to purchase the site for 5 years and it would now appear that some other departments have raised certain 'representations' at the eleventh hour. The Council's reasoning for the site removal is contradictory as the Council have invested significant resources into the proposed acquisition. It is the representors opinion that a small extension to the Castle Quarry Traveller Site would have far less impact upon the community than the allocation of a new site adjacent to Monkton Recreation Ground.	Pembroke	GT/095/LDP2/3		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		See Response to 1830/1	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4485	Ann Lankshear, Fiona Harries, Mark Ferrier, Simon Ferrier, Chris Lankshear				1	Object	FC5.GN24.01	DP GN 24 Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations		We object to this addition for many reasons. They already have a site which could be enlarged. There are other sites in Pembrokeshire equipped with services, e.g Kingsmoor. There are far more sites already in Pembrokeshire, Carmarthenshire and around Cardiff than the rest of Wales. The new site has caused the settlement line to be moved. Yet other applications have been refused in the same area, with a small site next to the main road. Development of the site would cause major unnecessary cost and outlay for Pembrokeshire County Council, plus a new road for access. We object to 6 acres of meadowland being added to the settlement for gypsy travellers, when we applied for 1.9 acres to the east of Orange Hall Lane opposite Council House on Angle Road. These could've been properties for over 65s, who are at present living in larger family homes, freeing up much needed accommodation. This site was on the roadside, whereas land behind the playfield needs an access road built. If this site can be put into the settlement, why not the other? IT would have benefit the community and is close to a shop, post office and bus stop.	Pembroke	GT/095/LDP2/2				The objection is in relation to the proposed allocation of a Gypsy Traveller Site at Monkton, Pembroke. This Focussed Change relates to edits in relation to other proposed allocations for Gypsy Traveller sites. It also appears to refer to a representation submitted at Deposit stage the response to which can be found in https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission Consultation Report Appendix 4, Section 4.2 referred to as New Site 3 Land at Orange Hall south of B4320 Monkton Main Road. This is dealt with at paragraph 20 of the section. Although this representation **is not duly made** (1) The appropriateness of the Monkton Gypsy Traveller allocation will be considered through Examination as a result of representations submitted by others and (2) the objectors original representation will also be dealt with through Examination.	No

6.28. DP GN 38 Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of the Mineral Resource

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
1830	Mr W Jenkins	Priory Farm		A C Crompton	5	Object	ME 16 - Map Edits	DP GN 38 Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of the Mineral Resource	No	Removal of Gypsy Site Allocation GT/095/LDP2/1 Castle Quarry Eastern Extension ME16 - Map Edits. For the reasons stated above, objection to the proposed Map Edit under GN38 ie Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of Mineral Resource - to add the additional area to HR/01. The Council has not undertaken any testing/investigations to confirm suitability or extractability. There is no practical means of gaining suitable access to the land without causing significant environmental & ecological harm.	Pembroke	GT/095/LDP2/4		The amendment suggested is contrary to National Planning Policy and/or Guidance.		LDP 2 policy GN 38 is the Council's local response to the requirements set out in Welsh Government's Planning Policy Wales edition 12 (PPW) regarding the safeguarding of the plan area's mineral resource. PPW edition 12 paragraphs 5.14.2, 5.14.7, 5.14.8, 5.14.9 and 5.14.12, with 5.14.9 are of particular relevance in providing a basis for the Council's approach on this matter. In particular, the first sentence of PPW edition 12, paragraph 5.14.9, requires safeguarding in Plans and this must be shown on Proposals Maps . LDP 2, Deposit Plan 2's paragraph 5.2.19 explains that the Council excludes settlements from those safeguarded areas, the extent of which is defined using settlement boundaries. The proposed deletion of the gypsy traveller allocation generates a consequential need to modify the Settlement Boundary and hence also the extent of minerals safeguarding. That is why there are also LDP 2 Focussed Changes at Castle Quarry relating to the positioning of the Settlement Boundary and to the extent of the safeguarded minerals resource. There is information in LDP 2, Deposit Plan 2, policy GN 38 reasoned justification paragraphs 5.221 to 5.224 on prior extraction requirements. For clarification, the Council has not allocated the site for mineral extraction.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4375	Mr M & J Morrillo		1966	Evans Banks Planning Ltd	3	Object	ME 15	DP GN 38 Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of the Mineral Resource	No	A portion of the allocation site is to be included within a 'Safeguarding and Prior Extraction of the Mineral Resource' are under GN 38. There are no active sites for the extraction of any of the hard rock in question in the vicinity of the settlement of Hill Mountain. The allocation of the land to form a 'buffer' is not necessary or required under national planning policy. The extraction of hard rock in such close proximity to existing and proposed residential units would be in conflict with national planning policy.	Hill Mountain	HSG/043/LDP2/1		The amendment suggested is contrary to National Planning Policy and/or Guidance.		See row below.	No
LDP 2 policy GN 38 is the Council's local response to the requirements set out in Welsh Government's Planning Policy Wales edition 12 (PPW) regarding the safeguarding of the plan area's mineral resource. In the context of this representation, PPW edition 12 paragraphs 5.14.2, 5.14.7, 5.14.8, 5.14.9 and 5.14.12, with 5.14.9 are of particular relevance in providing a basis for the Council's approach on this matter. The first sentence of PPW edition 12, paragraph 5.14.9 is reproduced here: *'Using the National Minerals Resource Maps and the National Aggregates Safeguarding Maps for Wales, areas to be safeguarded should be identified on proposals maps and policies should protect potential mineral resources from other types of permanent development which would either sterilise them or hinder extraction, or which may hinder extraction in the future as technology changes'*. LDP 2, Deposit Plan 2's paragraph 5.2.19 explains that the Council uses the BGS minerals mapping to define the areas for minerals safeguarding, but that the safeguarded areas exclude settlements, as defined by LDP 2 Settlement Boundaries. It follows from this that if the extent of a residential allocation included in LDP 2 is proposed for modification (as it has been at Hill Mountain), this generates a consequential need to modify the Settlement Boundary and hence also the extent of minerals safeguarding. That is why there are also LDP 2 Focussed Changes at Hill Mountain relating to the positioning of the Settlement Boundary and to the extent of the safeguarded minerals resource. There is information in LDP 2, Deposit Plan 2, policy GN 38 reasoned justification paragraphs 5.221 to 5.224 on prior extraction requirements. However, this sentence from paragraph 5.14.7 of PPW edition 12 is also relevant here and says: *'Safeguarding does not indicate an acceptance of mineral working, but that the location and quality of the mineral is known and that the environmental constraints associated with extraction, including the potential for extraction of mineral resources prior to undertaking other forms of development, have been considered'*. It follows from this that if the extent of a residential allocation included in LDP 2 is proposed for modification (as it has been at Hill Mountain), this generates a consequential need to modify the Settlement Boundary and hence also the extent of minerals safeguarding. That is why there are also LDP 2 Focussed Changes at Hill Mountain relating to the positioning of the Settlement Boundary and to the extent of the safeguarded minerals resource.																

6.29. DP GN 44 Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4410	Pembrokeshire Living Ltd		4409	Lichfields	9	Support	FC5.GN44.01	DP GN 44 Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity	Yes	Pembrokeshire Living Limited welcomes changes proposed at FC5.GN44.01 which appropriately addresses concerns highlighted in previous representations.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.30. DP GN 46 Coastal Change

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
1507	Welsh Government					Comment	FC5.GN46.01	DP GN 46 Coastal Change		The deletion of Policy 46 recognising the revised TAN15 published 31 March 2025. Deletion of the policy will ensure there are no conflicts between the policy and the revised TAN15. However, does having no local policy adequately ensure TAN15 is delivered at the local level? Would the plan benefit from a local policy on this issue, or is the plan deliverable when reliant on TAN15?						Policy GN 46 was included in the Plan when the revised TAN 15 remained in preparation. The content of the Policy is now wholly covered by the revised TAN 15 which provides a comprehensive policy context. No further amendment is proposed.	No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			11	Support	FC5.GN46.01	DP GN 46 Coastal Change	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.31. DP GN 48 Green Wedges

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
1830	Mr W Jenkins	Priory Farm	3911	A C Crompton	4	Object	FC5.GN48.Pembroke.01	DP GN 48 Green Wedges	No	Removal of Gypsy Site Allocation GT/095/LDP2/1 Castle Quarry Eastern Extension FC5.GN48.Pembroke.01 - Objection to the proposal to include the Castle Quarry Eastern Extension site into the Extended Green Wedge (GN/96). The Council state the inclusion will be a 'positive change'. This is not agreed with. It is considered that the allocation would lead to a more planned approach to development in this location.	Pembroke	GT/095/LDP2/4		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		See Response to 1830/1	No
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	12	Object	FC5.GN48.01	DP GN 48 Green Wedges		Haven endorses FC/GN48.01 as it reflects its previous representation and confirms the age of the evidence base (6 years old). Haven welcome the factual change but recognise that the evidence base has not been reviewed since 2019. Haven's previous representation on DP GN 48 (Green Wedges) on the Tenby/Penally green wedge remains.						Noted. The Council's response to this matter is set out in the response to the Deposit Plan representation (ref 4388/6). weblink to report: https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission see - See Supporting Documents, Appendix 2 Representation Reports updated 24 September 2025.	No

6.32. DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4468	James Ferraby				1	Object	FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		Object to any proposal to develop the land. It is an area of natural beauty, home to bats, owls, herons, and other animals. The land is an old quarry and natural floodplain. Lifting the open space designation would remove an important safeguard and open the door to future development. Building here would be environmentally irresponsible and unsafe, posing serious flooding risks and long-term instability. Protect this land for preservation, and safeguarding nature, public safety and the future of our community. Any development would permanently damage the outlook for many local residents. It would diminish the character of the area.	Pembroke	OSP/095/23		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		As detailed within Section 4.20 'Pembroke Housing' within Appendix 4 Issues Papers of the Consultation Report (weblink:https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission) , the western portion of the land designated as Open Space at Slothy Mill (OSP/095/23) has been subject to re-evaluation and consequently has not been designated as open space, due to its agriculture use. The land does not meet the criteria for open space as set out in the Open Space Assessment Background paper, paragraph 5.4. Land is required to meet one of the following characteristics, namely public parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspaces, green corridors, outdoor sports facilities, amenity greenspace, provision for children and young people, allotments, community gardens, and city (urban) farms, cemeteries and churchyards, accessible areas of countryside in the urban fringe, civic spaces or water. A number of representations object to the removal of the western portion as the removal of the designation will enable the land to be developed in the future. Candidate Site 087 (Land at Slothy Mill, Well Hill), which covered a similar portion of land to the area removed from OSP/095/23 designation, was submitted for consideration as a designated site for residential development. However, with the Highway Authority has reviewed Candidate Site 087 (capable of accommodating approximately 12 residential units) and has strongly objected due to significant constraints that cannot be mitigated. The site was therefore not considered an appropriate site for residential development and the land itself remains outside of the Pembroke Settlement Boundary.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4469	Josie Ferraby				1	Object	FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		Object to any proposal to develop the land. It is an area of natural beauty, home to bats, owls, herons and other animals. The land is an old quarry and natural floodplain. The designation of the land as open space would prevent the potential use of land as a housing estate. Building here would be environmentally irresponsible, and it also poses serious risks of flooding and long-term instability. Protect this land for preservation, and to safeguard nature, public safety and the community's future. Any development would permanently damage the outlook for many local residents. It would diminish the character of the area.	Pembroke	OSP/095/23		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		As detailed within Section 4.20 'Pembroke Housing' within Appendix 4 Issues Papers of the Consultation Report (weblink:https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission), the western portion of the land designated as Open Space at Slothy Mill (OSP/095/23) has been subject to re-evaluation and consequently has not been designated as open space, due to its agriculture use. The land does not meet the criteria for open space as set out in the Open Space Assessment Background paper, paragraph 5.4. Land is required to meet one of the following characteristics, namely public parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspaces, green corridors, outdoor sports facilities, amenity greenspace, provision for children and young people, allotments, community gardens, and city (urban) farms, cemeteries and churchyards, accessible areas of countryside in the urban fringe, civic spaces or water. A number of representations object to the removal of the western portion as the removal of the designation will enable the land to be developed in the future. Candidate Site 087 (Land at Slothy Mill, Well Hill), which covered a similar portion of land to the area removed from OSP/095/23 designation, was submitted for consideration as a designated site for residential development. However, with the Highway Authority has reviewed Candidate Site 087 (capable of accommodating approximately 12 residential units) and has strongly objected due to significant constraints that cannot be mitigated. The site was therefore not considered an appropriate site for residential development and the land itself remains outside of the Pembroke Settlement Boundary.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4472	Celtic Homes Ltd		1955	Boyer Planning	3	Support	FC5.GN52.PembrokeDock.02	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	Yes	See row below.	Pembroke Dock	HSG/096/LDP2/3	Support welcomed. No change required.				No
Land at Upper Sycamore Woods, Pembroke Dock (formerly Candidate Site 074) now HSG/096/LDP2/3 - focussed change FC5.GN16.PembrokeDock.02 We welcome the focussed changes, which confirm the site's allocation for residential development (HSG/096/LDP2/3) and removal of the previous open space designation. Earlier representations raised concerns regarding the plan period (2017-2033) and whilst the Focussed Changes do not alter the plan period, the inclusion of the site as a new housing allocation helps mitigate some of the risks associated with the compressed Plan timeframe. Allocating HSG/096/LDP2/3 increases the Council's short term deliverable supply, reducing reliance on long-term allocations. **FC.GN52.PembrokeDock.02** - Support the omission of 0.31HA from GN 52, OSP/096/LDP2/10. The land is of low ecological and landscape value, and currently offers no biodiversity benefit or contribution to Pembrokeshire's GI strategy (failing to meet Test 2). The allocation of the Site for housing will result in a net biodiversity benefit, through the implementation of a detailed landscape strategy.																
4479	Mr P Parnell		4273	BABB Architects Ltd	1	Support	FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	Yes	Support the Focussed Change to amend open space reference OSP/095/23 to remove the western section. There is no right of public access to the land at Slothy Mill. The Open Space Assessment background paper of 2019 dedicated the site as informal outdoor space. There is a shortfall of the outdoor space target, however the current LDP does not include the secondary school fields of Henry Tudor School, which can be used by the community. Ysgol Bro Penfro has also opened since 2018 and will have a resulted in a potential increase in Open Space.	Pembroke	OSP/095/23	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4481	Michael Ireson				1	Comment	FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value		My four immediate neighbours and I have at no stage been informed of the proposed change of use to the land rear of our properties from Amenity land to farm land, a change of use from amenity land to farm land constitutes a material change of use and requires planning permission which involves a formal consultation process where neighbours should be notified and as such we believe that the council has failed in its obligation in giving us reasonable notice as to the proposed changes for the land.	Pembroke	OSP/095/23				As detailed within Section 4.20 'Pembroke Housing' within Appendix 4 Issues Papers of the Consultation Report, the western portion was removed from OSP/095/23 as, upon re-evaluation, the land did not satisfy the criteria for the designation of open space as set out in the Open Space Assessment Background Paper. The western portion was incorrectly classified as Open Space, when it is in agricultural/grazing use. FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01 addresses this error. The change from 'amenity land to farm land' corrects the Council's earlier error in classifying the land as Open Space and accurately reflects the current land type. It does not refer to permission being granted for a change of use on site. Therefore no neighbour notification was sent, as would've be done had an application for planning permission have been made on the land. As the representor has made a Focussed Change representation, they are now registered on the database and will receive notification of Development Plan related consultations moving forward.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4482	Carol Davies				1	Object	FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	No	I suspect that the removal of amenity status for the land, is a precursor to housing development. I feel the field is unsuitable as there is far too much traffic in the vicinity. Also the field has amenity status to maintain its beauty, rural attractiveness and wildlife. It would be wrong to develop such a special and importance resource.	Pembroke	OSP/095/23		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		As detailed within Section 4.20 'Pembroke Housing' within Appendix 4 Issues Papers of the Consultation Report (weblink:https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission), the western portion of the land designated as Open Space at Slothy Mill (OSP/095/23) has been subject to re-evaluation and consequently has not been designated as open space, due to its agriculture use. The land does not meet the criteria for open space as set out in the Open Space Assessment Background paper, paragraph 5.4. Land is required to meet one of the following characteristics, namely public parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspaces, green corridors, outdoor sports facilities, amenity greenspace, provision for children and young people, allotments, community gardens, and city (urban) farms, cemeteries and churchyards, accessible areas of countryside in the urban fringe, civic spaces or water. A number of representations object to the removal of the western portion as the removal of the designation will enable the land to be developed in the future. Candidate Site 087 (Land at Slothy Mill, Well Hill), which covered a similar portion of land to the area removed from OSP/095/23 designation, was submitted for consideration as a designated site for residential development. However, the Highway Authority has reviewed Candidate Site 087 (capable of accommodating approximately 12 residential units) and has strongly objected due to significant constraints that cannot be mitigated. The site was therefore not considered an appropriate site for residential development and the land itself remains outside of the Pembroke Settlement Boundary.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4483	Robin Smith				1	Object	FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	No	We object to the amendment of the protection of open spaces with amenity value as detailed within change FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01. The land, as used for cattle grazing previously, and currently as for the grazing of horses has clearly a wealth of flora and fauna benefiting not only adjacent properties such as ours, but the wider environment also. The risk of losing this biodiversity as a result of this change is likely to increase significantly and to the detriment of this area. Additionally, should the land be developed, this would result in our property being surrounded by properties on all four sides.	Pembroke	OSP/095/23		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		As detailed within Section 4.20 'Pembroke Housing' within Appendix 4 Issues Papers of the Consultation Report, the western portion of the land designated as Open Space at Slothy Mill (OSP/095/23) has been subject to re-evaluation and consequently has not been designated as open space, due to its agriculture use. The land does not meet the criteria for open space as set out in the Open Space Assessment Background paper, paragraph 5.4. Land is required to meet one of the following characteristics, namely public parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspaces, green corridors, outdoor sports facilities, amenity greenspace, provision for children and young people, allotments, community gardens, and city (urban) farms, cemeteries and churchyards, accessible areas of countryside in the urban fringe, civic spaces or water. A number of representations object to the removal of the western portion as the removal of the designation will enable the land to be developed in the future. Candidate Site 087 (Land at Slothy Mill, Well Hill), which covered a similar portion of land to the area removed from OSP/095/23 designation, was submitted for consideration as a designated site for residential development. However, with the Highway Authority has reviewed Candidate Site 087 (capable of accommodating approximately 12 residential units) and has strongly objected due to significant constraints that cannot be mitigated. The site was therefore not considered an appropriate site for residential development and the land itself remains outside of the Pembroke Settlement Boundary.	

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4484	Mr & Mrs Edward & Zita Doyle				1	Object	FC5.GN52.Pembroke.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	No	The removal of the amenity status to the land to the rear of our property, we feel would be a grave mistake. It currently provides a diverse space used for grazing horses and where nature can do its own thing. If the amenity status was removed it would have an environmental impact, loss of biodiversity. The amenity status is designated for its enjoyment of wildlife conservation and ecological benefit. The amenity status is protecting this land. We feel the only reason to remove the amenity status is an attempt to develop the land for housing which we feel is totally unsuitable.	Pembroke	OSP/095/23		The amendment suggested is not supported by the Plan's evidence base.		As detailed within Section 4.20 'Pembroke Housing' within Appendix 4 Issues Papers of the Consultation Report (weblink:https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan-review/submission), the western portion of the land designated as Open Space at Slothy Mill (OSP/095/23) has been subject to re-evaluation and consequently has not been designated as open space, due to its agriculture use. The land does not meet the criteria for open space as set out in the Open Space Assessment Background paper, paragraph 5.4. Land is required to meet one of the following characteristics, namely public parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspaces, green corridors, outdoor sports facilities, amenity greenspace, provision for children and young people, allotments, community gardens, and city (urban) farms, cemeteries and churchyards, accessible areas of countryside in the urban fringe, civic spaces or water. A number of representations object to the removal of the western portion as the removal of the designation will enable the land to be developed in the future. Candidate Site 087 (Land at Slothy Mill, Well Hill), which covered a similar portion of land to the area removed from OSP/095/23 designation, was submitted for consideration as a designated site for residential development. However, with the Highway Authority has reviewed Candidate Site 087 (capable of accommodating approximately 12 residential units) and has strongly objected due to significant constraints that cannot be mitigated. The site was therefore not considered an appropriate site for residential development and the land itself remains outside of the Pembroke Settlement Boundary.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			12	Support	FC5.GN52.Llanteg.etc.01	DP GN 52 Protection of Open Spaces with Amenity Value	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.33. DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	19	Support	FC5.GN56.01	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development		PRL Partnership endorses FC5.GN56.01.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	12	Comment	FC5.GN56.02	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	No	See row below.						Policy 56 allows new sites to be considered within or adjacent to the largest settlements (see Criterion A). Criterion C allows for consideration of extension of existing sites without the distance requirement. On reflection the Inspector may wish to consider the appropriateness of including reference to 400m within the supporting text as the words 'adjacent to' may suffice. No further changes are proposed.	No
PRL Partnership objects to FC5.GN56.02, echoing earlier objections to the 400m threshold noting that a more nuanced approach is needed for development outside a settlement boundary. The 400m threshold disproportionately impacts existing caravan and camping sites that are 400m away from existing settlements or where the sites are already large. Risks undermining the objectives of emerging policy SP 17 - limiting development opportunities and ability to make meaningful investments to respond to demand from visitors and upgrades. It fails to recognise that development in rural areas has to be treated differently to those in urban areas to support communities and businesses. Suggestions: "Proposals for new medium or large sites will be favourably looked upon where they are within or adjacent (within 400m) to a settlement, consistent with the sustainable strategy and settlement hierarchy of the Plan…" - would support new sites in locations closer to settlement boundaries but not prevent otherwise high quality developments at existing parks coming forward. Previous representation which stated that "Paragraph 5.3.19 appears to introduce policy not covered by the policy itself" remains important. There is clearly a need for flexibility to reflect sites not within 400m of a settlement boundary. Adding this distance to the supporting text only serves to provide uncertainty over the application of the policy. 400m is an arbitrary figure and in many cases does not reflect the accessibility of a particular site.																

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	14	Comment	FC5.GN56.03	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	No	See row below.						The Council considers that Focussed Change FC5.GN56.03 provides an accurate and appropriate definition of Landscape Capacity consideration. Consideration of strategic and cummulative impacts are necessary and a usual element of considering planning applications more generally.The policy does not infer that the presence of existing developments would prevent proposals coming forward. No further change is proposed.	No
Change no. FC5.GN56.03 offers a definition of landscape capacity, however, whilst on its own the definition is acceptable, it should not be used for the purpose of applying the proposed policy which seeks to limit development within a particular area in accordance with landscape character scale assessment. If the policy remains unchanged from original drafting, the proposed definition should be amended to reflect an assessment of the impacts of a development against the impacts upon the landscape character area. PRL Partnership recognises the importance of ensuring that the cumulative impacts of development need to be acceptable, bearing in mind proposed mitigation. However, the assessment of development needs to be assessed against the existing context at a site level not landscape level. Doing so, could result in unintended consequences of the LPA refusing sensible development, simply because there is indeed existing development. PRL Partnership does not endorse FC.GN56.03, definition should be amended with proposed wording as follows: "Landscape capacity is the amount of change that a landscape character area can accommodation beyond which the changes would have an unacceptable adverse impact to the integrity of the landscape character which cannot be mitigated". This definition aligns with the evidence base found within paragraph 2.10 and 4.4 of the PCCC Caravan, Camping and Chalet Landscape Capacity Assessment (Nov 2019).																
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	13	Support	FC5.GN56.01	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	Yes	Haven endorses FC5.GN56.01.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	20	Support	FC5.GN56.01	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	Yes	Haven endorses FC5.GN56.01.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	14	Object	FC5.GN56.02	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	No	See row below.						Policy 56 allows new sites to be considered within or adjacent to the largest settlements (see criterion A). Criterion C allows for consideration of extension of existing sites without the distance requirement. On reflection the Inspector may wish to consider the appropriateness of including reference to 400m within the supporting text as the words 'adjacent to' may suffice. No further changes are proposed.	No

Haven objects to FC5.GN56.02, echoing earlier objections to the 400m threshold noting that a more nuanced approach is needed for development outside a settlement boundary. The 400m threshold disproportionately impacts existing caravan and camping sites that are 400m away from existing settlements or where the sites are already large.

Risks undermining the objectives of emerging policy SP 17 - limiting development opportunities and ability to make meaningful investments to respond to demand from visitors and upgrades. It fails to recognise that development in rural areas has to be treated differently to those in urban areas to support communities and businesses.

Suggestions: "Proposals for new medium or large sites will be favourably looked upon where they are within or adjacent (within 400m) to a settlement, consistent with the sustainable strategy and settlement hierarchy of the Plan..." - would support new sites in locations closer to settlement boundaries but not prevent otherwise high quality developments at existing parks coming forward.

Previous representation which stated that "Paragraph 5.3.19 appears to introduce policy not covered by the policy itself" remains important. There is clearly a need for flexibility to reflect sites not within 400m of a settlement boundary. Adding this distance to the supporting text only serves to provide uncertainty over the application of the policy. 400m is an arbitrary figure and in many cases does not reflect the accessibility of a particular site.

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	15	Object	FC5.GN56.03	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	No	See row below.						The Council considers that Focussed Change FC5.GN56.03 provides an accurate and appropriate definition of Landscape Capacity consideration. Consideration of strategic and cummulative impacts are necessary and a usual element of considering planning applications more generally.The policy does not infer that the presence of existing developments would prevent proposals coming forward. No further change is proposed.	No
Change no. FC5.GN56.03 offers a definition of landscape capacity, however, whilst on its own the definition is acceptable, it should not be used for the purpose of applying the proposed policy which seeks to limit development within a particular area in accordance with landscape character scale assessment. If the policy remains unchanged from original drafting, the proposed definition should be amended to reflect an assessment of the impacts of a development against the impacts upon the landscape character area. Haven recognises the importance of ensuring that the cumulative impacts of development need to be acceptable, bearing in mind proposed mitigation. However, the assessment of development needs to be assessed against the existing context at a site level not landscape level. Doing so, could result in unintended consequences of the LPA refusing sensible development, simply because there is indeed existing development. Haven does not endorse FC.GN56.03, definition should be amended with proposed wording as follows: "Landscape capacity is the amount of change that a landscape character area can accommodate beyond which the changes would have an unacceptable adverse impact to the integrity of the landscape character which cannot be mitigated". This definition aligns with the evidence base found within paragraph 2.10 and 4.4 of the PCCC Caravan, Camping and Chalet Landscape Capacity Assessment (Nov 2019).																
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			13	Support	FC5.GN56.01	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			14	Support	FC5.GN56.02	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			15	Support	FC5.GN56.03	DP GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.34. DP GN 57 Site Facilities

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4477	PRL Partnership		4409	Lichfields	15	Object	FC5.GN57.01	DP GN 57 Site Facilities	No	See row below.						The Council's considers that the need for the best practicable environmental standards is satisfactorily explained through Focussed Change FC5.GN57.01. The site facilities listed under FC.GN57.01 are not conclusive but rather given as examples of types of facilities found on caravan and camping sites and would not preclude consideration of any other facilities. No further change is considered necessary.	No
PRL Partnership recognises that the FC has clearly attempted to address its initial representation. However, it has not removed the requirement for best practicable environmental standards. There is no reason as to why site facilities must reach best practicable environmental standards when this term is not required for any other types of development in the Plan. Other policies within the emerging plan, including GN.1 and GN.2, provide a robust framework considering the acceptability of any new facilities in planning terms. The requirement for best practicable standards should be deleted. The changes introduced at FC5.GN57.01 suggests that the policy is limited. Site facilities were previously undefined, but the amendment to paragraph 5.323 seeks to restrict the policy to what could be classed as guest facilities only. The supporting text removes references to other facilities, which are necessary for the running of sites. PRL Partnership considers that the examples of site facilities are deleted.																

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4478	Haven Leisure Ltd		4409	Lichfields	16	Object	FC5.GN57.01	DP GN 57 Site Facilities	No	Haven recognises that the FC has clearly attempted to address its initial representation. However, it has not removed the requirement for best practicable environmental standards. There is no reason as to why site facilities must reach best practicable environmental standards when this term is not required for any other types of development in the Plan. Other policies within the emerging plan, including GN.1 and GN.2, provide a robust framework considering the acceptability of any new facilities in planning terms. The requirement for best practicable standards should be deleted. The changes introduced at FC5.GN57.01 suggests that the policy is limited. Site facilities were previously undefined, but the amendment to paragraph 5.323 seeks to restrict the policy to what could be classed as guest facilities only. The supporting text removes references to other facilities, which are necessary for the running of sites. Haven considers that the examples of site facilities are deleted.						The Council's considers that the need for the best practicable environmental standards is satisfactorily explained through Focussed Change FC5.GN57.01. The site facilities listed under FC.GN57.01 are not conclusive but rather given as examples of types of facilities found on caravan and camping sites and would not preclude consideration of any other facilities. No further change is considered necessary.	No
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			16	Support	FC5.GN57.01	DP GN 57 Site Facilities	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.35. DP GN 58 Self-catering Accommodation

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34751	Kathyrn Bradbury	Amroth Community Council			17	Support	FC5.GN58.01	DP GN 58 Self-catering Accommodation	Yes	Amroth Community Council have reviewed the relevant Focussed Changes and support the amendments.			Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.36. DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4288	J Mills & R Ariss				4	Object	FC6.App2.Jeffreyston.01	DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory	Yes	An objection to HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) due to concerns regarding the busy highway, frequented by tractors and trailers, and the inability of the school to accommodate any more students. Development of HSG/047/LDP2/1 (South of the Crown) would disrupt lives and businesses. The smaller site identified would be a much better location to focus development, and would cause minimal disruption.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1				Please see response to representation 4288/1.	No

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
4470	Mr & Mrs P Sherwood				4	Object	FC6.App2.Jeffreyston.01	DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory		The representor objects to the proposed development at HSG/047/LDP2/1 due to the lack of sewerage, lack of services, the school being at maximum capacity, marshy ground with drainage issues. The land is ecologically important. The site is not served by footways and the roads are heavily trafficked, make it unsafe for pedestrians. The site has known coal workings, which has been raised by the Coal Authority. The Council previously came to the view during an earlier consultation on candidate sites that the land wasn't needed to meet the level of growth required - what has changed? The representor has family living opposite the proposed development and it will impact them severely.	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/4				Please see response to representation 4470/1	No
4474	Ian Evans		4277	JCR Planning Ltd	4	Support	FC6.App2.Jeffreyston.01	DP Appendix 2: Housing Components and Trajectory	Yes	See representation 4474/1	Jeffreyston	HSG/047/LDP2/1	Support welcomed. No change required.				No

6.37. Habitats Regulations Assessment

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
34450	Louise Edwards	Natural Resources Wales			1	Comment	Not Applicable	Habitats Regulations Assessment		NRW have no comments to make in respect of the current consultation and will await the submission of a draft Position Statement in response to NRW's updated conservation Regulation 37 advice and conditions assessment for marine protected areas. A meeting is set for the 24th September 2025.						A meeting was held with NRW on the 24th of September 2025. Officers had provided NRW with a copy of its Position Statement which sets out its response to NRW's advice regarding the Pembrokeshire Marine SACin June 2025. NRW are supportive of the approach in principle and will provide any further detailed comments by the 1st of October 2025. The document will be provided to PEDW as part of the final part of Submission.	No

6.38. SA Appendix 2: Objectives Appraisal

Representor Number	Representor	Representor Organisation (where relevant)	Agent Stake Holder ID	Agent Company Name	Representation Number	Support or Object	Focussed Change reference	PCC Plan or Document Reference	Sound	Representor Comment Summary/ Suggested Change	Location	Site Reference	PCC Agree	PCC Disagree	PCC Agree in Part	Edit not required as PCC Document or National Policy ref/paragraph ref below sufficient or explanation of edit required.	Edit Required
2242	Mr & Mrs V Rogers				3	Object	FC6.App2.Jeffreyston.01	SA Appendix 2: Objectives Appraisal	No	Representor repeats their previous comments regarding the allocation of Site 524 Land front B4586 (HSG/047/LDP2/1 Land south of the Crown) The village does not have the infrastructure for the housing development - no shops, public transport. The development would cause more traffic on already busy narrow roads, heavily used by farm machinery. The local school is full. There is wildlife on site that would be severely impacted by the development. The LDP Issue Report references two trees in the hedgerow fronting the B4586 having Ash Dieback. Only one tree has this. The ash and sycamore opposite High Croft and Casa-Mia properties are healthy. The site is prone to flooding and has a stream running through it. There are mine workings on site. There are no main sewers in the village. Site 375 (allocated in LDP1) would be sufficient to meet future housing needs.						Please see response to representation 2242/1.	No