

Abbreviations

JUDP	Joint Unitary Development Plan for Pembrokeshire 2000-2016
LDP / LDP (2)	Local Development Plan / Local Development Plan (2)
LPA	Local Planning Authority
PCC	Pembrokeshire County Council
WG	Welsh Government

Glossary of Terms

Adopted	The Local Development Plan is adopted when the Authority's Council Meeting decides it will be the Development Plan for the County and replace the existing Development Plan.
Affordable Housing	Residential development for sale or rent below market prices and retained as affordable in perpetuity
Affordable Housing Allocation	Land allocated for affordable housing either low cost home ownership or to rent.
Availability and Deliverability of Land	Available land includes a landowner willing to develop or sell for development. Deliverability relates to the economic viability of bringing a site forward
Countryside	Land outside of settlements identified within the Settlement Hierarchy
Deposit Plan	A full draft of the Plan which is available for public consultation during the Deposit Period.
Housing Allocation	Residential development sites for a minimum of 5 units and shown within the Development Plan
Infrastructure	Infrastructure encompasses power supplies, water supply, means of sewage or surface water disposal, roads and other transportation networks, telecommunications and facilities that are required as a framework for development.
Market Housing	Housing for sale at market prices (can include self-build or custom build housing).
Infill and rounding off	This is when housing development takes place in a location where there is no settlement boundary. In such locations new housing may be permitted where it is between existing gaps of properties 'infill' or where it is 'rounding off' an edge of a settlement.
'Planning by Appeal'	Ad hoc development proposals which come forward in the absence of a development strategy to guide development
Preferred Option	The single option or hybrid option resulting from the consideration of a range of options or issues following consultation.

Preferred Strategy	The first formal strategy document for the review of the LDP which sets out the framework and overarching policies that will guide the policies and proposals relating to land use.
Review Report	Sets out what in the LDP needs to change and why.
Settlement Boundary	A settlement boundary is a planning tool which involves a theoretical line drawn on a map to identify the boundary to a settlement. Typically housing development is only permitted within this boundary and areas outside it are considered to be countryside.
Settlement Hierarchy	Settlements are classified within the hierarchy according to the population and level of services within the settlement. Some very small settlements with very limited or no services will fall outside the hierarchy and are defined as countryside.
Self build/custom build housing	Bespoke housing development commissioned and managed by the intended occupier. In all cases whether a home is self-build or custom build, the initial owner of the home will have primary input into its final design and layout.

Contents

Abbreviations	2
Glossary of Terms.....	2
Introduction	5
<i>Local Development Plan Review</i>	5
<i>Strategic Options Consultation</i>	5
<i>Stakeholder, Member and Town and Community Council Workshops</i>	5
<i>Next steps</i>	5
Table 1: Feedback from Stakeholder, Member and Town and Community Council Workshops July 2018	6

Introduction

Local Development Plan Review

Pembrokeshire County Council is preparing a replacement Local Development Plan (LDP) – **Local Development Plan 2**. When adopted, it will provide a revised and updated policy framework to guide development outside of the National Park and inform planning decisions taken by the County Council. During the **Review**, the existing Local Development Plan (up to 2021) will remain in place until Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) is adopted.

Strategic Options Consultation

During the period between 16th July and 10th September 2018, Pembrokeshire County Council ran an informal public consultation on **Strategic Options** for the LDP 2. As part of this consultation, two papers were published, one on **Draft Issues, Vision and Objectives** and one on **Strategic Housing Options**. The second paper **Strategic Housing Options** set out various scenarios for future levels of housing growth and broad locations/policy options to consider for accommodating this growth. Both documents were made available on the Council website and in libraries and contact centres. All of those who had registered an interest in the LDP were informed of the informal consultation. A separate **Report of Informal Public Consultation on LDP 2 Strategic Options** sets out the written responses received to the consultation.

Stakeholder, Member and Town and Community Council Workshops

As well as an informal written consultation, Pembrokeshire County Council also held a number of **engagement workshops** with Stakeholder, Members and Town and Community Councils in July 2018. The focus of these workshops was on the **Strategic Housing Options**. A summary of the feedback received in those workshops is set out in **Table 1** below.

Next steps

The feedback received through the informal written consultation and in the workshops with Stakeholders, Members and Town and Community Councils will be considered and taken forward in the development of the LDP 2 **Preferred Strategy**. Pembrokeshire County Council anticipates publishing its **Preferred Strategy** for formal public consultation in December 2018.

Table 1: Feedback from Stakeholder, Member and Town and Community Council Workshops July 2018

Group Session and Group Number	Response to Consultation Questions
	<p>Q1. Which growth option do you think would best achieve the Plan's draft Vision?</p> <p>Option 1 – 196 dwellings a year Option 2 – 340 dwellings a year Option 3 – 408 dwellings a year Option 4 – 443 dwellings a year Option 5 – 416 dwellings a year Option 6 – 572 dwellings a year</p>
Stakeholders' Seminar (19th July)	
Group 1	Options 4, 5 and 6 supported
Group 2	Option 3 supported
Group 3	Option 5 (Options 3 and 4 also supported)
Group 4	Options 3-5 supported
Town and Community Council Seminar Day event (18th July)	
Group 1	Options 3 and 4 supported
Group 2	Options 3 and 4 preferred (Option 5 also supported)
Group 3	No clear preference
Town and Community Council Seminar Evening Event (24th July)	
Group 1	Option 4 or 5 preferred.
Group 2	Need for an economy driven options which is linked to jobs.
Members' Seminar 16th July	
North and Northeast	Option 5 (Options 4 and 6 also supported)

Mid	Dwelling led approach supported (Options 4-6)
South and South West	Options 3-5 generally supported
South East	Option 6 to provide flexibility and deliver between 450-500 a year
<p>Conclusions:</p> <p>A mixed range of opinions were received, however it is notable that no groups supported Option 1 (WG –based projected need for 196 dwellings a year) or Option 2 (based on short term migration trends). Although a number of options were identified by the groups, these were generally Options 3-5 all of which would involve provision of 400-450 dwellings a year, based on either long term migration trends or average build rates over a 5-10 year period. One Members’ group supported Option 6, the current LDP provision of 572 dwellings a year but on the basis that this would provide flexibility with an aim of delivering between 450 and 500 dwellings a year.</p> <p>A general consensus appears to exist to support provision above the levels identified in WG projections and meet need based on an assessment of longer term migration trends (15 years) and in line with average build rates over the last 5-10 years. One commentator in the stakeholder group noted that the closure of the Milford Haven Refinery in 2014 was likely to have had a significant impact on outward migration levels and the overall population, given its position as a large local employer, with a comment that on this basis, using a longer period of time to assess migration was valid. Groups in the sessions expressed the view that delivering above WG projections would support the local building industry, enable delivery of greater levels of affordable housing (given Pembrokeshire’s backlog of need), deliver a more balanced population profile and provide a greater opportunity for young people to remain in their communities. A number of groups commented that an economic strategy to deliver jobs and support housing was also essential.</p>	
	Q2. Do you support the settlement hierarchy approach based on services?
Stakeholders’ Seminar (19th July)	
Group 1	Yes Suggested greater score for Post Offices and community halls to reflect the number of community groups which use them.
Group 2	Yes Suggested more points should be given to sustainable transport provision.

Group 3	Yes More weight should be given to schools, public houses and community halls. Suggested Post Offices should be downgraded as they are used less frequently.
Group 4	Yes Suggested that the 3 key services should be schools, shop and public transport links. Post Offices do not have the importance they once had and should be downgraded. Shops should stay the same. Sustainable travel should have increased weighting. Community Halls should consider number of users. Should weight local employment and use figure of local jobs number.
Town and Community Council Seminar (18th July)	
Group 1	No, but couldn't offer an alternative approach.
Group 2	Yes Should give more weight to settlements with railway services and good road access.
Group 3	Yes On schools – should think about what age range they serve Where settlements are close together should sometimes look at an aggregated score Should look at local employment/business eg Folly Farm has a big impact on Begelly.
Town and Community Council Seminar (24th July)	
Group 1	Yes Petrol stations should be scored as should public convenience. Should increase weighting of community hall. Llanteg and Llanteglos should be grouped together.

Group 2	No Should look at distance to services and population.
Members' Seminar (16th July)	
North and Northeast	Yes Can we include analysis of comparison with where PCNPA settlements sit in scoring Higher score should be applied to a crèche Question on definition of a shop School should have 5 points
Mid	Yes But should tweak scoring and look at connections between settlements eg multi user paths which connect villages to places with services. Give more weight to schools.
South and South West	Yes
South East	Yes – provided appropriate growth at each level of hierarchy.
Conclusions:	
<p>There is general support for the concept and use of a settlement hierarchy based on an assessment of services.</p> <p>Some groups commented on the potential to look at the relationship of settlements to other settlements with services. This option was discussed further in the Rural Options section under the term 'clusters'.</p> <p>A number of detailed points about the scoring system were made, with some conflicting comments received. Overall, a recommendation to score settlements with both schools and frequent transport links more highly appeared to have strong support, with a number of groups suggesting that the role played by a Post Office is of decreasing importance. Amendments to the proposed scoring system will be made to pick up on these suggestions. Additional weight will also be given to the presence of a community hall in a settlement, moving it into the top level service category. Additional points are now given to creche facilities and children's playground facilities. Although the suggestion</p>	

to assess the number of users has merit, difficulties associated with gathering this information reliably mean that this suggestion will not be incorporated. A recommendation to add in information on the number of local jobs in an area and score linked to that was also suggested, however due to an incomplete response to the Rural Facilities questionnaires sent out in 2017 it is not possible to incorporate this at present. Data from the Nomis website is not available at a settlement level and there are accuracy concerns about disaggregating this information down to such a small level from County level. Consideration has already been given to overall population levels within a settlement.

There was support for PCC developing an information note for those settlements which are split between both the PCC and PCNPA's planning jurisdiction, setting out where they sit in both Authorities hierarchies.

	Q3. Do you agree with the classification of settlements as Urban/Rural and their position in the hierarchy?
Stakeholders' Seminar (19th July)	
Group 1	Yes – but Narberth should be Urban
Group 2	Narberth should be Urban. Merlins Bridge is part of Haverfordwest.
Group 3	Narberth should be Urban.
Group 4	Shouldn't use term Hub Towns, now dated. Should assess Towns and analyse the services in them/what settlement hierarchy of Towns is.
Town and Community Council Seminar (18th July)	
Group 1	Narberth – should be Urban. Should split towns into those that need regeneration and those doing ok.
Group 2	Narberth should be a Hub Town. Illogical that Goodwick is and Narberth isn't. Lamphey should be higher up settlement hierarchy.
Group 3	Narberth is a rural town. Merlins Bridge is part of Haverfordwest in a similar way to Steynton and Hubberston/Hakin being part of Milford Haven.
Town and Community Council Seminar (24th July)	

Group 1	Merlin's Bridge should be considered as a separate entity to Haverfordwest.
Group 2	Narberth should be considered rural. It serves a very wide hinterland. Merlins Bridge should be separate to Haverfordwest.
Members' Seminar (16th July)	
North and Northeast	Narberth should be urban, happy with all other classifications.
Mid	Merlins Bridge should be a rural village and separate to Haverfordwest.
South and South West	Why are Tiers Cross and Thornton at the same level in the hierarchy?
South East	Largely agree with the split. Llanteg and Llanteglos are interlinked and should be considered together as with Carew/Sageston. Settlements such as Milton which are well connected by transport routes but have lost a shop should be reconsidered. (Schools and crèche should be weighted more highly).
<p>Conclusions: General agreement on the Urban/Rural classification across all groups.</p> <p>There were two areas where differing views were expressed particularly in the case of Narberth and whether it is an urban or rural settlement and Merlins Bridge (whether or not it forms a part of Haverfordwest).</p> <p>Support was expressed for grouping Llanteg and Llanteglos to be considered together as a single settlement, because of the strong interaction between the two.</p>	
	<p>Q4. Which Spatial Option do you think best delivers the Plan's Draft Vision?</p> <p>Option 1: 70% Urban, 30% Rural Split</p>

	Option 2: 60% Urban, 40% Rural Split Option 3: 50% Urban, 50% Rural Split
Stakeholders' Seminar (19th July)	
Group 1	Option 1 (Option 2 also had some support) Most sustainable to deliver services.
Group 2	Option 1 or Option 2
Group 3	Option 2 preferred but Option 3 also supported
Group 4	Option 2 (Option 1 also had some support)
Town and Community Council Seminar (18th July)	
Group 1	Option 3 (Option 2 also some support)
Group 2	Support for all options
Group 3	Support for all options, Option 2 most support.
Town and Community Council Seminar (24th July)	
Group 1	Option 3
Group 2	Option 1
Members' Seminar (16th July)	
North and Northeast	Option 2 and Option 3 supported
Mid	Mixed views – more support for Options 2 and 3 than 1.
South and South West	Mixed views – Option 2 had 1 more vote than Options 1 and 3.
South East	Split between Option 2 and Option 3.
Conclusions: A range of opinions were received on the overall spatial split that the Plan should deliver, with stakeholders identifying both benefits and disadvantages to all options. Issues for consideration included supporting rural communities, impacts on the Welsh language, prioritising support for town regeneration, linking employment to housing delivery, prioritising previously developed land, delivery of housing in sustainable locations, impacts on landscape, impacts on service delivery costs for public service bodies and climate change from car	

emissions. Overall delivering Option 2 (60% Urban and 40% Rural) is likely to provide support to both Urban and Rural communities but with a greater emphasis on those locations with better access to services.	
	Q5. Which options for the rural areas best deliver the Plan's Vision? Q6. Which options do you support?
Stakeholders' Seminar (19th July)	
Group 1	Settlement boundaries – support Clusters – support Infill and rounding off – no support Support market housing with contributions to affordable housing
Group 2	Settlement boundaries – support Clusters – support, connectivity critical Infill and rounding off – not supported unless in settlement boundaries, if outside settlement hierarchy – why should it take place in that location? Affordable housing in more rural locations can be counterproductive as people need to access services.
Group 3	Settlement boundaries – support Clusters – support Infill – should be for affordable only and still close to a settlement
Group 4	Settlement boundaries – support but need to reflect individual character of settlements Clusters – support Infill and rounding off – can work but needs a strongly defined policy Market/affordable – should only be where there are services
Town and Community Council Seminar (18th July)	
Group 1	Settlement boundaries – support Clusters – support Affordable housing only in rural areas supported

Group 2	<p>Settlement boundaries – support</p> <p>Clusters – support</p> <p>Infill and rounding off – include opportunities for infill and rounding off within the settlement</p> <p>Affordable should be permitted where some services to avoid rural isolation.</p>
Group 3	<p>Settlement boundaries – support but need reviewing</p> <p>Clusters – might work in some cases but shouldn't be applied everywhere</p> <p>View that 100% AH in Small Local Villages hasn't worked as don't have key services to support people. Support for Market housing in these locations but with large contributions towards affordable housing.</p>
Town and Community Council Seminar (24th July)	
Group 1	<p>Settlement boundaries – support but have a buffer zone to allow for growth along the settlement edge.</p> <p>Clusters – supported</p> <p>Self-build properties should also be permitted in Local Villages as well as Affordable Housing.</p>
Group 2	<p>Settlement boundaries – support for these but with more flexibility within the boundary for growth.</p> <p>Clusters – supported – distance important as are cultural and functional relationships.</p> <p>Infill and rounding off – allow within settlement boundaries</p> <p>Affordable/Market housing – need both within Local Villages</p>
Members' Seminar (16th July)	
North and Northeast	<p>Settlement boundaries – support this with a mix of infill and rounding off</p>

	<p>Clusters – support</p> <p>Infill and rounding off – support with settlement boundaries in some areas</p> <p>Want conversions of traditional buildings on farms to be enabled.</p>
Mid	<p>Settlement boundaries – support but with flexibility for growth within them</p> <p>Clusters – support</p> <p>Infill and rounding off – support</p> <p>Affordable/market housing – supported a mix of market and social housing in villages.</p>
South and South West	<p>Settlement boundaries – supported for all the hierarchy</p> <p>Clusters – more detail needed on this approach</p> <p>Infill and rounding off – supported, potential hybrid approach where areas outside settlement boundaries but adjacent deemed appropriate for development.</p> <p>Market/Affordable – should be no blanket ban on market housing.</p>
South East	<p>Settlement boundaries – support.</p> <p>Clusters – support for these. Consider school catchments.</p> <p>Infill and rounding off – support including for farmsteads.</p>
<p>Conclusions:</p> <p>Strong support from all groups for the use of settlement boundaries within the settlement hierarchy, although a number commented on the need to reflect the specific characteristics of a settlement. There was also support for taking a more generous approach when defining settlement boundaries and introducing more opportunities for infill and rounding off within them.</p> <p>There was widespread support for clusters, although recognition that this approach may not work everywhere.</p>	

Mixed views on infill and rounding off, with some support and some concern about how this approach might undermine a focus on development in sustainable locations.

For the smallest Local Villages there was a mixture of views on the type of housing that should be permitted, but the majority appeared to favour some market housing provision, with greater contributions towards affordable housing.

	Q7. Would you like to see any other Housing Options considered?
Stakeholders' Seminar (19th July)	
Group 1	None proposed.
Group 2	None proposed.
Group 3	None proposed.
Group 4	None proposed.
Town and Community Council Seminar (18th July)	
Group 1	None proposed.
Group 2	None proposed.
Group 3	None proposed.
Town and Community Council Seminar (24th July)	
Group 1	Allocation and approaches in settlements close to or split across PCC and PCNPA planning areas need joined up thinking.
Group 2	None proposed.
Members' Seminar (16th July)	
North and Northeast	Land to be made available for Community Land Trusts only.
Mid	Potential for a new settlement somewhere to be considered. Smaller sites potentially more deliverable than large sites.
South and South West	None presented.

South East	<p>Potential for a new settlement – Cross Hands suggested. Need to consider home working and home offices. Potential to explore a local connection requirement for market housing.</p>
<p>Conclusions: A number of groups identified further options. These included a need for a joined up approach on split settlements between PCC and PCNPA, the potential for entirely new settlements, the need to support Community Land Trusts, need to support home working and a potential requirement for a local connection policy for market housing. These options will be further explored as work develops on the LDP.</p>	