

CABINET MEETING: 12 JUNE 2014

**CARDIFF DEPOSIT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN:
SUBMISSION FOR INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION**

**REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, TRAFFIC
AND TRANSPORT**

AGENDA ITEM: 16

PORTFOLIO: TRANSPORT, PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY

Reason for this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - Provide an overview of the representations made on the Deposit LDP and alternative sites consultation stages together with an outline of responses to the main issues raised including whether or not focussed changes are considered necessary in order to ensure the LDP is sound and if minor editing changes are required to resolve/update text;
 - Secure approval for the submission of the Deposit LDP and the required accompanying documents to the Welsh Government for independent examination; and
 - Secure delegated powers for the Cabinet Member and/or Senior Officers to agree potential changes to the Deposit LDP as part of the independent examination process in accordance with Welsh Government guidance.

Background

2. The LDP provides the strategy and policy framework for the development and conservation of the County for the 20 year period, from 2006 to 2026. It will be used by the Council to guide and control development, providing the basis by which planning applications will be determined consistently and appropriately.
3. On 26 September 2013 the Council approved the Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan for the purposes of a six week public consultation process which was carried out between 15 October and 26 November 2013. As prescribed by Welsh Government regulations, a further public consultation process was carried out on alternative sites submitted by landowners and developers in response to the Deposit Plan. This

process was carried out between 11th February and 4th April 2014. Consultation was carried out with a wide range of bodies, organisations and members of the public at each stage including events at numerous locations around the city.

4. The next stage in the LDP preparation process is the submission of the Deposit Plan to the Welsh Government for examination by an Independent Planning Inspector. However, before this takes place, the Council must consider the representations made from the Deposit Plan and alternative sites consultation stages and decide if any changes are considered necessary to ensure the LDP is sound prior to submitting the Deposit LDP and supporting documentation for independent examination.

Summary of representations and consideration of issues

5. Overall, 1,652 representations were received to the Deposit LDP from 407 organisations, bodies and individuals. Some of the representations either sought new sites not shown in the Deposit LDP, objected to allocations in the Deposit LDP or sought amended boundaries or uses to sites allocated in the Deposit LDP. These responses produced a total of 52 alternative sites of which 24 related to proposed new alternative sites, 11 to the deletion of allocated sites, 6 to boundary changes and 11 to amended uses of allocated sites. The consultation process on these alternative site proposals generated representations from 403 organisations, bodies and individuals.
6. In accordance with Development Plan regulations the Council is now required to consider the representations received in advance of submission of the Deposit LDP to the Welsh Government for independent examination and consider if any changes are necessary to ensure the plan is sound.
7. The main issues emerging from the Deposit LDP and alternative sites consultation along with an outline of the responses to these issues are summarised in Appendix A to this report under the following headings:
 - Consultation on Deposit LDP and alternative sites;
 - LDP Vision, Objectives and Strategy;
 - Scale of housing growth;
 - Strategy to deliver housing growth including strategic sites;
 - Delivery of strategic sites including phasing;
 - Delivery of infrastructure and transportation solutions;
 - Affordable housing;
 - Gypsy and Traveller needs;
 - Economy and employment;
 - Green Belt;
 - Protection of built and natural environment;
 - Minerals and Waste; and
 - Flood risk.
8. In considering the potential need for changes to the Deposit LDP in response to issues raised, full regard must be given to relevant Welsh

Government and Planning Inspectorate guidance. In this respect, it is recognised that if a Local Authority has carried out the plan making process properly there should be no need to change the Deposit LDP. Furthermore, any focussed changes should only be made if they are considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound. Guidance clearly states that changes should be avoided, and if they are necessary to ensure the plan is sound, be kept to a minimum. If focussed changes are proposed, they will need to be formally advertised and subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environment Assessment.

9. Specifically, guidance requests Local Authorities to consider whether a suggested change is necessary to make the plan sound. If the answer is no, then there is no need to suggest a change to the Deposit LDP. It should also be remembered in this context that the Inspector's role is not to improve the plan, but to recommend only those changes needed to make the Plan sound.
10. With regard to potential minor changes which do not impact upon the scope of policies, guidance states that any minor editing changes including drafting and typographical amendments should be set out in a separate minor changes schedule and submitted along with the Deposit LDP.
11. Having carefully considered the issues raised from the consultation processes, it is considered that there are no compelling or demonstrable reasons to propose any focussed changes to the Deposit LDP which was approved by Council 9 months ago in September 2013. In fact, further emerging new evidence and ongoing work relating to transportation, masterplanning and infrastructure planning has helped to address many of the concerns raised through the consultations. Appendix A to this report provides a summary of how the main issues have been considered.
12. However, there is considered a need for some minor changes to text within the Deposit LDP to reflect points raised through consultations regarding updated circumstances, factual amendments and minor typing/clarification changes. None of the minor changes alter the scope of policies contained in the Plan. All such minor changes are included in the Schedule of Minor Changes which will form one of the submitted documents listed in Appendix B to this report.

Documents to be submitted

13. Appendix B to this report provides a full list of the documents and supporting information which are proposed to be submitted to the Welsh Government for independent examination. This is considered to represent a range of material and evidence considered necessary to meet the relevant LDP tests of soundness and further supports and clarifies policies in the Plan. A summary of key documents and headings of wider supporting material is provided below:
 - Deposit LDP (including appendices and plans);
 - Final Sustainability Appraisal;

- List of Supporting Documents;
- The Community Involvement Strategy;
- The Consultation Report;
- Copy of all representations made to the Deposit Plan and Alternative Site consultation process; and
- Statement of suggested main issues for consideration at the examination and a suggested procedure for dealing with them.

The Independent Examination process

14. Once the Council has submitted the Deposit LDP and all relevant documentation to the Planning Inspectorate, an Independent Inspector will be appointed on behalf of the Welsh Government to examine the Plan. The examination process will then commence straight away. Should the Inspector seek clarification on any significant issues relating to soundness, an Exploratory Meeting may be held ahead of any hearing. Otherwise a Pre-Hearing Meeting will take place to discuss the arrangements for hearings. After considering all of the evidence, the Inspector will prepare a binding report that will be sent to the Council.
15. In accordance with Welsh Government guidance and in order to enable the efficient and timely running of the examination, measures should be put in place to permit effective dialogue between the independent Inspector and Council representatives. It is therefore proposed that delegated powers are vested with relevant Directors, Operational Managers and Senior Officers so that they can negotiate issues, agree amendments and respond to requests for further information as required by the Inspector during the examination process including the Hearing Sessions. Should discussions or requests for further information involve potential significant changes to the LDP, the relevant Senior Officers will liaise with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning and Sustainability ahead of the relevant Hearing Sessions or deadline for providing information.
16. A Programme Officer has already been appointed to manage the day to day arrangements and running of the examination process. In line with the Delivery Agreement for the LDP, formal approval is sought to submit the LDP to the Planning Inspectorate in August 2014.

Reasons for Recommendations

19. To enable the Council to submit a Deposit LDP and accompanying documents to the Welsh Government and to the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005.

Legal Implications

20. A local planning authority has a statutory duty to produce a local development plan (LDP). The Planning Authority's statutory duties in this regard are set out in Part 6 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires that an LDP is made subject to independent

examination to determine whether it is “sound”. LDP’s must be sound in terms of their content and the process by which they are produced. The relevant Guidance, ‘Local Development Plans Wales’ sets out the tests of soundness which an LDP must meet in terms of procedure, consistency, coherence and effectiveness.

Financial Implications

21. The anticipated costs associated with progressing the Council’s Local Development Plan to the next stage, can be met from within the Directorate’s 2014/15 revenue budget allocation and if necessary, sums drawn down from the Development Plan Reserve Account. The next stage includes submission of the plan to the Welsh Government Planning Inspectorate, following approval at Council. Approval of the recommendations will ensure that the Council has in place the necessary delegated authority to allow effective dialogue to take place between the independent inspector and senior Council representatives, as part of the examination process. Monitoring will be undertaken as the process progresses to assess any future resource requirements and if deemed necessary, considered as part of the Council’s Medium Term Financial Plan for 2015/16.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Cabinet is recommended to:

- (1) note and accept the content of paragraph 11 and Appendix A and agree that the Deposit LDP together with all supporting documentation listed in Appendix B are forwarded to Council for final approval and then submitted to the Welsh Government and Planning Inspectorate in accordance with the LDP Regulations; and
- (2) Recommend to Council that in accordance with Welsh Government guidance and in order to facilitate the efficient operation of the examination process, that measures are put in place to permit effective dialogue between the independent Inspector and Council representatives as detailed in paragraph 15 of this report.

ANDREW GREGORY

Director

6 June 2014

The following Appendices are attached

Appendix A: Summary of main issues emerging from the Deposit LDP and alternative sites consultation along with an outline of the responses to these issues

Appendix B: List of documents to be submitted to the Welsh Government for independent examination

Appendix A

Summary of main issues emerging from the Deposit LDP and alternative sites consultation along with an outline of the responses to these issues

1. Consultation on Deposit LDP and alternative sites

- 1.1 As stated in paragraph 5 of the report, 407 organisations, bodies and individuals commented on the Deposit LDP generating 1,652 representations. Just over two thirds of the responses were from the general public with just under a one third from organisations, bodies, Local authorities and politicians. This Appendix provides a summary of the main issues arising from the comments made and includes an outline of the response to these issues. Further supporting information to the plan will be submitted to inform the examination process and is listed in Appendix B to the report. Additionally, a summary of each representation made on the Deposit LDP together with the Council's response is contained as an Appendix to the Consultation Report.
- 1.2 All representations received as part of consultation on the Deposit Plan were analysed and those representations that related to particular site allocations were advertised and comments invited between 11th February and 4th April 2014. A total of 52 site allocation representations were identified comprising 24 new alternative sites, 6 proposed boundary amendments, 11 proposed deleted Deposit LDP allocations and 11 amendments to site allocation policies in the Deposit LDP.
- 1.3 The 24 new alternative sites proposed by respondents comprise:
- 20 proposals for residential development on a range of greenfield (14) and brownfield sites (6);
 - a proposal for employment land at Pengam Green;
 - a proposed waste management facility south of Wentloog Avenue;
 - a proposed renewable energy park at Rover Way; and
 - a proposed new district retail centre at Pontprennau.
- 1.4 The 6 boundary amendments related to proposed changes to residential allocations (either seeking a larger area or exclusion of an area), amendment to the proposed settlement boundary at Morganstown and a larger Green Belt allocation to include land in the east of the city between Cardiff and Newport.
- 1.5 The 11 proposed deleted sites comprised all the greenfield strategic sites allocated in the Plan, the Green Belt policy relating to land north of the M4 and four of the non-strategic housing sites.
- 1.6 The 11 proposed amendments comprised changes of uses to proposed allocations in the Plan including 5 proposed residential allocations on areas identified as employment land in the Plan, reallocation of the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Seawall Road to employment use,

reallocation of the proposed Health related use site at St Agnes Road, Heath to residential, omission of Maes-y-Llech Farm from the North West Cardiff strategic site, omission of the Queens Gate Car Park, Butetown from the Central and Bay Business Area, omission of land from the North West Cardiff strategic site in order to retain it as a green corridor and re-allocation of the strategic sites north of Junction 33 and south of Creigiau and surrounding land as Green Belt.

- 1.7 A total of 403 representations were received from the consultation process seeking views on the submitted Alternative Sites with the majority of representations supporting the deletion of the greenfield strategic housing sites. Other findings illustrated a high level of support for the retention of the Green Belt policy relating to land north of the M4 whilst most alternative site proposals received representations in support of their site proposal.
- 1.8 In terms of responding to these representations it is important to note that extensive evidence contained within the Deposit LDP and supporting documentation demonstrates the need to provide the level of new homes and jobs set out in the LDP which is consistent with the overall Plan Strategy and takes full account of cross-boundary considerations. The LDP shows how this need can be met including the allocation of a range and choice of sites with over 60% of dwelling provision over the plan period being met from brownfield land.
- 1.9 Furthermore, policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on the Masterplanning approach including phasing, infrastructure planning and sustainable transportation solutions. This approach shows how development can be managed, phased and all impacts mitigated including factors relating to the natural environment, flood risk, infrastructure/capacity issues, transportation implications, community facilities, air quality, contaminated land, built environment, culture/language, land quality and impact on adjacent areas/features.
- 1.10 Sections 2 to 6 of this Appendix provide an overall summary of the consideration of representations in relation to the above matters. This helps inform whether any alternative site proposals are considered necessary to make the Plan sound. A summary of each of the representations generating the 52 alternative site proposals along with the Council's response (whether the alternative proposals are supported or not) are included as part of the Council's response to the Deposit LDP consultation as an Appendix to the Consultation Report referred to in paragraph 1.1, above. Additionally, a summary of each representation made in relation to the alternative sites consultation process together with the Council's response is also contained as a separate Appendix to the Consultation Report.

2. LDP Vision, Objectives and Strategy

- 2.1 A relatively low number of responses made explicit reference to the LDP vision, objectives, strategy or 'whole plan' matters. Those issues raised included the need for a more regional approach, less reliance on greenfield sites, concerns around the level of growth together with delivering transportation solutions and wider infrastructure. There was also support for the Plan, particularly the masterplanning approach to manage the delivery of new development.
- 2.2 Overall, no compelling evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the LDP strategy is inherently unsound. Indeed, the vision, evidence and strategy respond to the clear evidenced need to make provision for new homes and jobs. The strategy is considered to not only provide the appropriate level of growth based on up to date evidence but also deliberately sets out a framework to manage this necessary development. The masterplanning approach embodied in the strategy recognises the need to bring forward new infrastructure, deliver sustainable transport solutions and mitigate the impacts of new development in a managed way.
- 2.3 Key Policies, Detailed Policies and supporting information are fully consistent with the overall vision, objectives and strategy. Collectively, they demonstrate how the overarching strategy can be delivered.
- 2.4 With regard to references to the city-region dimension, it should be stressed that significant cross-boundary collaborative dialogue has taken place to help inform the Plan and supporting documentation evidences the extent of this work. Importantly, the plan specifically helps deliver the vision of Cardiff being at the heart of a thriving city-region and there was a strong consensus for this approach as evidenced through the regional collaborative exercise
- 2.5 Dialogue will continue with partners from around the city-region, particularly with the likelihood of a new Planning Act setting out the requirement to prepare a Strategic Development Plan for the Cardiff Capital Region. However, a new Act is not likely to be in place until at least 2016 and LDPs will remain part of the Development Plan hierarchy.
- 2.6 Therefore, the urgent need for Cardiff to have an up to date LDP in place remains paramount to overcome the real problems caused by having out of date Development Plans, an insufficient supply of housing land and latent demand for new homes. Appeals have been lost for new homes in the countryside so there is an urgent need to prevent further 'ad hoc' developments by providing a framework to effectively manage the delivery of necessary new homes, jobs and associated infrastructure.
- 2.7 With regard to comments regarding the greenfield/brownfield split in the Plan, it should be noted that over 60% of the housing provision over the plan period is met from brownfield sites. Together with the greenfield sites, this will provide an excellent range and choice of opportunities to deliver

the level of growth. Furthermore, it should be remembered that the previous LDP was withdrawn largely because the brownfield-only strategy was not considered capable of delivering the evidenced housing need (for a far lower overall figure). A brownfield-only approach is therefore not supported by evidence.

3. Scale of housing growth

3.1 Approximately 125 representations were specifically made on Key Policy 1 which set out the level of growth in the plan: 41,100 new dwellings and 40,000 new jobs over the plan period. Of these representations, feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 53% considered level of growth too high
- 8% considered level of growth about right
- 6% considered level of growth an absolute minimum
- 5% considered level of growth too low
- 11% considered a regional approach required
- 17% made other comments such as queries on flexibility allowance

3.2 Those who considered the level of growth too high gave a number of reasons including concern at the validity/credibility of the official projections, unrealistic/optimistic projections, scale of growth not considered deliverable and impacts of this level of growth, especially on transport. In contrast, those seeking a higher level stated the plan should be closer to or at the same level of the official projections. The Home Builders Federation and a number of developers stated the level of growth should be an absolute minimum. Some comments did not explicitly state a preference but either referred to the need to adopt a regional approach/spread development into the valleys or raised other detailed matters such as how to manage future flexibility.

3.3 Of those representations stating the level of growth was too high and critical of the official projections together with supplementary analysis undertaken for the Council, no alternative assessments or modelling evidence has been provided. Welsh Government guidance makes it absolutely clear that the starting point for planning for new homes is the official local authority level household projections. This was again clarified in a letter from the Minister for Housing and Regeneration of 10th April, 2014.

3.4 The Deposit LDP used the 2008-based household projections as the most up to date 'starting point'. The projections equated to a need of 54,400 new homes for the plan period but analysis undertaken for the Council by Edge Analytics along with the consideration of other relevant factors provided the justification for the plan to set a level of growth for 41,400 new homes.

3.5 However, since the Deposit LDP has been approved, new 2011-based household projections have been issued (on 27th February, 2014). These project the number of new households increasing by 45,400 over the plan period. They are much lower than the previous projections and reflect a continued decline in household size at a lower rate than previously

assumed. (This was a theme identified in the assessment undertaken by Edge Analytics for the Council to inform the Deposit LDP).

- 3.6 The implications of these latest projections have been carefully considered. At the outset, it can be seen that the difference of new homes proposed in the Deposit LDP and the latest 2011-based projections is far closer (4,100 homes) than the 2008-based figures. Moreover, the evidence and reasons for the Council justifying a lower figure remain up to date with the new projections recognising a lower household formation rate.
- 3.7 Of particular note, and as referred to in many consultation responses, deliverability represents an important factor in the LDP. Having regard to all relevant factors including deliverability and using the 2011-based projections as starting point, the Deposit LDP figure of 41,100 new homes is considered to strike the appropriate balance between maximising Cardiff's role in responding to evidenced need and the ability to demonstrate effective deliverability. Wider matters relating to Plan deliverability are addressed in sections 4 and 5 of this appendix.
- 3.8 It should also be noted that the Deposit LDP has flexibility built-in for an additional 4,000 new homes, should these be required (as identified through the LDP monitoring process) in the later stages of the plan period. Additional work has been undertaken since the Deposit LDP was approved to provide more clarity and detail in relation to these areas and further evidences how additional land can be brought forward if required due to build rates being higher than expected.
- 3.9 Therefore, should the Inspector seek a level of new homes to meet the new 2011-based projections, land has already been identified in the plan capable of being brought forward if considered necessary. However, the Council remains of the view that these areas should be a 'last phase' only if monitoring indicates implementation is required before the end of the plan period.
- 3.10 Those organisations seeking a higher level of growth, including the Welsh Government and a number of developers/landowners, point to the LDP either being aligned to the Preferred Strategy level of 45,400 new homes or the official household projections which have now been reduced from 54,400 to 45,500 new homes. Therefore, in some respects, the 'area for debate' has been narrowed between the LDP level of 41,100 and latest projections of 45,500. In this respect, a level of growth below that contained in the plan is considered to fall short of delivering the overall plan strategy, does not effectively respond to evidenced needs and therefore does not represent a sound approach.
- 3.11 Comments raised regarding the need for a regional approach are addressed in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.6, above.

4. Strategy to deliver housing growth including Strategic Sites

4.1 The Deposit LDP proposes to provide for new homes over the plan period by a combination of:

- Dwellings already built (since 2006);
- Dwellings under construction;
- Dwellings with planning consent/ subject to Section 106 Agreement;
- Adjustments to housing stock over plan period;
- Windfall allowances for remainder of plan period;
- Strategic Sites- Policy KP2;
- Non-Strategic Sites- Policy H1; and
- Flexibility allowance if extra 10% required.

This equates overall to over 60% of homes being provided from brownfield sites.

4.2 Approximately 562 representations (34% of total representations overall) were made in relation to Strategic Sites (Policy KP2) and 61 representations made in respect of Non-Strategic Sites (Policy H1).

4.3 Of the comments made in respect of Policy KP2 for strategic sites, feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 29% made comments on Strategic Site KP2(E) South of Creigiau with the majority (27%) objecting to the inclusion of the site in the Plan ;
- 24% commented on Strategic Site KP2(D) North of Junction 33 on the M4 with the majority (23%) objecting to the inclusion of the site in the Plan;
- 22% made comments on Strategic Site KP2(C) North West Cardiff with the majority (18%) objecting to the inclusion of the site in the Plan;
- 10% made comments on Strategic Site KP2(F) North East Cardiff (West of Pontprennau) with the majority (8%) objecting to the inclusion of the site in the Plan;
- 3% commented on Strategic Site KP2(G) East of Pontprennau Link Road with all but one of these comments objecting to the inclusion of the site in the Plan;
- 3% comments on Strategic Site KP2(H) South of St Mellons Business Park with the majority (2%) objecting to the inclusion of the site in the Plan;
- 2% commented on Strategic Sites KP2(A) and (B) Cardiff Central Enterprise Zone and Former Gas Works, Ferry Road with over half (1%) supporting the inclusion of the sites in the Plan; and
- 7% made general comments in relation to the Strategic Sites or other sites which are not included in the Plan.

4.4 Of the comments made in respect of Policy H1 for non-strategic sites, feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 39% sought new 'alternative' non-strategic sites;
- 22% objected to proposed non-strategic sites;
- 16% supported the non-inclusion of small sites in Rhiwbina;
- 7% supported allocated non-strategic sites;

- 3% sought amendments to non-strategic sites;
- 13% raised other matters such as how sites should be developed

4.5 Most representations focussed on specific sites rather than the overall approach to delivering new homes and jobs summarised in paragraph 4.1, above. Indeed, as referenced in section 2 of this appendix, limited responses referred to the overall strategy and approach set out in the Plan. However, it is salient to note that the Welsh Government (Planning Division) response included reference to the overall strategy and stated that the Welsh Government:

- Does not object to the strategy proposed;
- Consider a sufficient range and choice of sites is provided for;
- Wish to support the aspirations of the plans strategy to deliver growth for Cardiff based on evidenced need; and
- Notes the evidence to support the strategic allocations and does not object in principle

Comments relating to deliverability, phasing and infrastructure factors raised by the Welsh Government are picked up in sections 5 and 6.

4.6 It is notable that no realistic alternative strategies to delivering growth have been submitted to demonstrate that the Plan is inherently unsound whilst showing how the alternative approach overcomes these issues. Comments relating to a more regional approach have already been covered in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.6, above. Similarly, suggestions for a brownfield-only approach have been covered in paragraph 2.7. Conversely, a small number of responses have considered the brownfield 'windfalls' assumption is too high. However, no compelling evidence has been presented to suggest the 40% of past build rate figure is fundamentally unsound and further work undertaken can evidence the realistic prospect of future delivery from this source consistent with the Plan target. Therefore, overall, it is considered that the strategy to deliver growth is sound and based on robust evidence.

4.7 In terms of the issues raised on specific sites through the consultation process, it can be noted that a small number of responses supported each Strategic Site, a slightly larger number raised general points such as the need to address particular matters when the site was developed but the majority of responses objected to the proposed sites giving a variety of reasons which are summarised below:

- Negative impacts of new development in respect of the transport network (especially congestion), natural environment, air quality, Welsh language/ cultural aspects (primarily in relation to South Creigiau and North of Junction 33 sites), flood risk, agricultural land, built environment/ heritage aspects and impacts on adjacent areas;
- Concern that sufficient supporting infrastructure would not be provided ('community infrastructure' as well as transport/sewers etc) or provided too late. Related to this, reference was made to existing facilities (Eg, Schools, sewers and GP surgeries) being at or over capacity;
- Concern that development would not be adequately phased and not effectively linked to new infrastructure (linked to above);
- Concern that rate of growth is not deliverable over the plan period;

- A regional approach is required; and
- Only brownfield sites should be developed.

The negative impacts of new development are addressed in following paragraphs with deliverability, phasing and infrastructure issues picked up in sections 5 and 6.

- 4.10 The Deposit LDP very deliberately sets out an approach to effectively manage new development; Policies, supporting text and documentation have shown how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development with details on the masterplanning approach including phasing, infrastructure planning and sustainable transportation solutions.
- 4.11 Work undertaken in preparing the Deposit LDP has already identified and positively responded to the range of issues raised through the consultation process. Material contained in supporting documents, most notably the Masterplanning Framework, demonstrate how impacts can be mitigated. Specifically, the Masterplanning Framework provides a set of 10 guiding General Principles which were developed through a process of focussed engagement including the direct input from the Design Commission for Wales. Furthermore, these principles have then been applied to each Strategic Site setting key requirements to ensure that high quality development is delivered in an orderly manner.
- 4.12 This approach shows how the negative impacts referred to in consultation responses can be effectively mitigated. Indeed, updated supporting documents will be submitted alongside the Deposit LDP to further outline the approach. Ongoing work consistent with the Deposit LDP approach will continue reflecting current studies, cross-boundary matters and dialogue with other bodies including developers/landowners. This will help further evidence relevant details to usefully inform the examination process and address issues raised.

5. Delivery of Strategic Sites including phasing

- 5.1 Sections 2 and 3 of this note have demonstrated that the overall level of growth contained in the Plan is considered to represent a sound and reasonable figure. To effectively deliver this level of growth over the plan period (2006-26), this will require a higher annual build rate than previous 5 and 10 year past-rate averages, of approximately 2,400 new homes per annum for the remainder of the plan period.
- 5.2 However, it should be noted that the current low build rate in part reflects the fact that Cardiff does not possess an up to date Development Plan and has no significant greenfield outlets underway. Additionally, as demonstrated by current landowner/developer activity in relation to progressing greenfield sites, there has been a build-up of latent demand for new homes in Cardiff over recent years. This, coupled with the extensive development of brownfield apartments in recent years, has created very favourable marketing conditions for new greenfield family and affordable housing which corresponds with evidence of housing need. The current development activity in terms of greenfield planning applications being progressed also helps to demonstrate that completions will

commence in the near future and avoid a potential hiatus in terms of delivery.

- 5.3 The Plan deliberately contains a wide range and choice of sites which can be available at any one time as each site will have a finite annual delivery rate based on site specific factors/constraints and marketing factors relating to supply and demand. The Strategic Site approach allows the phased development of sites over a period of time. Trajectories of provision for each site will be further updated through ongoing liaison with developers reflecting the number of available outlets at any one time together with the mix of private and affordable providers. However, work undertaken to date demonstrates the need for a balanced provision across all Strategic Sites during the remaining plan period to ensure a sufficient range and choice of offer at any one time which in turn directly supports the delivery of the annual build rate which is required to meet the evidenced need.
- 5.4 Paragraph 4.1 of this appendix shows the different ways new homes will be provided. Crucially, looking at the remainder of the plan period, the Plan contains five greenfield Strategic Sites which are capable of delivering 13,450 new homes. Together with brownfield Strategic Sites, existing commitments, windfalls and allowances and having regard to anticipated trajectories of provision on each site, this provides the necessary range and choice of sites to deliver the overall provision required.
- 5.5 With regard to the matter of phasing, many responses have raised concerns that developments will not be effectively controlled or 'cherry-picked' whilst others suggest an approach whereby some sites are phased later in the plan period.
- 5.6 Dealing with the first point, as has been the case in most large-scale developments in Wales and the UK, the development of all strategic sites will be carried out in phased manner. The Masterplanning Framework together with further Supplementary Planning Guidance and Planning Conditions, Section 106 Agreements and other undertakings can provide control and certainty in this respect. Importantly, phasing of homes will also be linked to the phased provision of infrastructure. Further work continues in articulating the precise arrangements and will be informed by current work, for example, the detailed studies relating to the Metro project. However, binding mechanisms are available and will be used by the Council to set appropriate triggers and thresholds to guarantee the delivery of appropriate infrastructure at the appropriate stages.
- 5.7 The concept of delaying the implementation of some Strategic Sites until later in the plan period would have serious and fundamental negative implications for the overall soundness of the Plan. In short, it would remove the ability to deliver certain sites in the short/medium term. Given the points raised in paragraph 5.3, above, regarding the finite capacity of any one site to deliver new homes in any one year, this approach would fundamentally undermine the ability of the Plan to deliver the required number of homes. The attempt to delay delivery would also be hard to

justify in the context of current national planning policy which seeks to promote a Planning System which is more proactive and positively brings forward the provision of new homes, jobs and infrastructure.

- 5.8 Furthermore, any attempt to delay delivery of specific sites is fraught with difficulty in terms of fairly justifying why any one particular site should be developed at a later date. This is even more challenging given Cardiff's context of having significant housing needs, an insufficient land supply and the likelihood that developers/landowners continue progressing planning applications which include supporting infrastructure and commit to wider financial contributions. In conclusion, there are considered no compelling grounds to support such an approach within the LDP which would fundamentally undermine the ability to deliver the Plan and create a situation not dissimilar to the previously withdrawn LDP where evidence could not be presented to support delivery.

6. Delivery of infrastructure and transportation solutions

- 6.1 This section specifically addresses issues/concerns raised about the ability of new development to deliver necessary new supporting infrastructure with specific reference to the delivery of sustainable transportation solutions. There is some overlap with issues raised in the preceding section but this section considers the delivery of infrastructure in greater detail rather than overall delivery and phasing in general.
- 6.2 This matter was identified in representations on the Plan as a whole and also in relation to individual sites as one of a range of reasons supporting objections to allocated sites. Specifically, 62 representations were made on KP8 relating to Sustainable Transport and 151 representations were made on detailed transportation-related policies (T1 to T8). Of the later comments, 60 representations were made in relation to T2 relating to Strategic Rapid Transit and Bus Corridor. The majority of the comments raised concerns about the deliverability of the transportation policies, whether the 50/50 modal split was realistic and concerns about traffic/congestion impacts on the highway network.
- 6.3 Dealing firstly with the delivery of necessary supporting infrastructure alongside the provision of new homes and jobs, paragraph 5.6, above, illustrates how the LDP together with other well established planning mechanisms can be used to provide a binding framework to bring forward the phased and orderly provision of new infrastructure.
- 6.4 The updated Infrastructure Plan will be submitted as a supporting document to the Plan and represents a comprehensive analysis of new infrastructure required over the plan period. It is split into different headings and has been developed in close liaison with relevant service providers from both within and outside the Council. Furthermore, relevant site-specific requirements have also been captured in the updated Masterplanning Framework document which will also be submitted as a supporting document to the Plan.

- 6.5 Therefore, information has been deliberately captured to quantify the scale of new infrastructure considered necessary to support new development. However, further detailed work is currently in the process of being undertaken to flesh out the more precise details in parallel with the ongoing Masterplanning work. Specifically, this will provide more clarity on triggers and thresholds for the provision of new infrastructure and quantify in greater detail the exact nature of new facilities or off-site works. Similarly, work will be progressed on identifying which guiding documentation and delivery mechanisms (Eg, Planning Conditions, Planning Obligations (Section 106, 278, etc), Council funding and external funding and/or Community Infrastructure Levy) are best suited to delivering different types of infrastructure.
- 6.6 Whilst a considerable volume of work has been undertaken to date to inform the LDP, it is premature at this juncture to provide explicit details on specific elements of infrastructure and precise delivery mechanisms. For example, key elements of work on the Metro are not yet completed and it would be premature to provide potential solutions in advance of the current studies now nearing completion. Also, work in progressing the Community Infrastructure Levy in Cardiff has not currently reached a sufficiently advanced stage to be factored into considerations in a detailed manner. However, sufficient work has been undertaken to date to support the LDP in terms of meeting the tests of soundness and further work including an updated viability study is being undertaken to more fully inform the examination process and will reflect further ongoing dialogue with relevant organisations. In addition there is potential for further site specific viability evidence to inform the level of contributions from developments towards infrastructure.
- 6.7 With specific regard to transportation aspects, the Deposit LDP sets out a clear approach based on delivering sustainable transportation solutions. The combination of KP8 and detailed policies T1 to T8 provide a suite of complementary policies to put in place a change in approach to bring about a 50:50 modal split of all trips on Cardiff's transport network by the end of the Plan period in 2026.
- 6.8 Comments received on KP8 raise a number of questions and concerns including whether the target of a 50:50 modal split is realistic and achievable and also whether proposals for supporting transport infrastructure are realistic and deliverable. Comments received in relation to Policies T1 – T8 cover a range of issues and concerns including: whether the transport proposals are sufficient to accommodate the scale of growth; the impacts of development on highway routes which are already congested with traffic; the feasibility and affordability of specific rapid transit routes; and, the need for transport infrastructure to be in place ahead of development.
- 6.9 The 50:50 modal split target is derived from detailed modelling and transport assessment work carried out by the Council when preparing the LDP. This work showed that a 50:50 modal share will be necessary to avoid unmanageable levels of congestion of the highway network and to keep the network functioning. Policy KP8 and supporting transport policies

make provision for the Council to, through the planning process, to secure the transport infrastructure necessary to facilitate sustainable travel and guard against any unacceptable impacts.

- 6.10 The LDP Master Planning Framework will further enable the Council to secure essential infrastructure as part of the LDP strategic sites and to make this provision integral to their design and delivery. It will also enable the Council to control the implementation of transport infrastructure through each development phase. Thus, whilst the final public transport provisions for a major site may not be in place on day one of development, mechanisms will be available to secure sustainable travel options (e.g. by way of additional bus services) for the occupiers of earlier phases. For the above reasons the transport policies are considered to address the key issues raised by respondents to the Plan consultations.

7. Affordable Housing

- 7.1 The affordable housing policy contained in the Deposit LDP aims to assist the Council in meeting evidenced housing need by seeking an appropriate housing contribution from new residential developments in the city. The policy sets out a target of 20% affordable housing on brownfield sites and 30% affordable housing on greenfield sites in all residential developments which contain 10 or more dwellings or exceed 0.3 hectares in gross site area.
- 7.2 Welsh Government guidance requires local authorities to include affordable housing policies in their LDPs where a Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) has provided evidence of need. The Cardiff LHMA update (2013) indicates an annual shortfall of 2,989 affordable dwellings per annum.
- 7.3 Approximately 15 representations were made in relation to Policy H3 Affordable Housing, of the comments made feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:
- 26% (4) sought a wider definition of affordable housing to include innovative forms of provision such as developer shared equity and low cost home ownership;
 - 20% (3) supported policy;
 - 20% (3) sought reference in the policy to the potential for securing affordable housing through off site contributions;
 - 13% (2) sought deletion of reference to requirement for sites over 50 to be accompanied by independent viability study;
 - 7% (1) stated the viability study lacked sufficient detail and the policy if adopted in its current form would impact on delivery;
 - 7% (1) expressed concern regarding the lowering of the percentages from the Preferred Strategy figure of 40%; and
 - 7% (1) objected to the threshold stating it should be 1 not 10 dwellings.
- 7.4 In response to comments seeking a wider definition of affordable housing it is important to note that the definition contained within the Deposit Plan accords with Welsh Government guidance and states that affordable

housing encompasses both social rented and intermediate housing where there are secure mechanisms in place to ensure that it is accessible to those who cannot afford market housing, both on first occupation and for subsequent occupiers. Given the need for the Plan to accord with national guidance it would be inappropriate to include a wider definition in the Plan.

- 7.5 In terms of off site contributions the Council will normally expect affordable housing to be provided on site but it is recognised that in exceptional circumstances securing affordable housing through off site contributions may be appropriate. Such circumstances will be set out in detailed guidance contained in the Affordable Housing SPG as referenced in paragraph 5.14 of the Plan.
- 7.6 Comments were received seeking deletion of the requirement for an independent viability study on sites of 50 or more dwellings. It is considered that this is necessary to ensure the Council consider what is an appropriate level of affordable housing contribution in an open and transparent manner and ensure that such provision, along with other 'policy costs' will not make the scheme unviable.
- 7.7 With regard to the issue of targets set out in Policy, it should be stressed that the targets are derived from the findings of the housing viability study undertaken by Peter Brett Associates which assessed the viability of a range of housing scenarios for different development types with varying levels of affordable housing. In order to demonstrate viability and take account of the higher costs associated with the development of brownfield sites the study recommended a two tiered affordable housing target and confirms that affordable housing is viable at 30% on greenfield sites and 20% on brownfield sites whilst making provision for other 'policy costs' including community infrastructure.
- 7.8 On the topic of thresholds, the threshold of 10 or more dwellings is defined taking into account the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012 which notes "major development" is the total number of dwellings to be 10 units and over. This is consistent with the annual Joint Housing Land Availability (JHLAS) process undertaken as part of the requirement of TAN1. The threshold of ten units for affordable housing reflects this definition thereby assisting with the administration and assessment process. The economy of scale also comes in to play here with such sites, totalling fewer than 10 units, not usually being supplied by the large house building companies. Major house builders enjoy the advantages of economies of scale from mass construction. Schemes of 9 units and below are generally built by local house builders, whose construction costs are markedly higher. In order to encourage house building and the local economy it seems prudent that minor sites in urban areas, which do not provide a significant level of affordable provision, are set below the threshold.

8. Gypsy & Traveller Needs

- 8.1 The Deposit Plan sets out a criteria based policy for assessing proposals for new Gypsy and Traveller sites and in response to need evidenced in

the Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment allocates a site for 65 pitches at Seawall Road, Splott. This allocation caters for more than the immediate need (43 pitches) identified in the study. It was identified as part of an independent study which assessed potential sites within the city to accommodate this need and follows criteria set out in national guidance relating to availability, suitability and achievability.

8.2 Six representations were made on Policy H7 which allocates land at Seawall Road for a Gypsy and Traveller site and 3 representations were made on Policy H8 Sites for Gypsy and Traveller Caravans. Of the comments made on these two policies feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- The Welsh Government and Newport (22%) stated insufficient provision had been made to meet need in LDP identified in needs assessment (108 pitches) and possibility of replacement site for Rover Way (21 pitches);
- The Welsh Government and Celsa (22%) objected to loss of land earmarked for the possible future business expansion of Celsa;
- The Welsh Government and Natural Resources Wales (22%) stated the site was in flood zone C2 and until phase 3 flood study completed questions remained about deliverability of the site;
- The local ward Member (12%) objected to site on grounds of selection, size and scale of proposed site, location on flood plain, loss of land earmarked for business expansion and social issues; and
- The Welsh Government and Natural Resources Wales (22%) sought minor changes to criteria in policy and supporting text.

8.3 In response to comments relating to insufficient provision for Gypsy and Travellers the allocation of a new site for 65 pitches at Seawall Road represents a major provision in a national context and demonstrates the Council's continued commitment to responding to the needs of a large Gypsy and Traveller community. This represents meeting more than the immediate needs in Cardiff (43 pitches) as identified in the needs assessment. However, it is acknowledged that this does not satisfy the overall level of need identified in the needs assessment. This is a reflection of the unprecedented level of need to be addressed in a Wales context together with the limited suitability of other potential sites as shown through consideration of the study to identify potential sites. Since the Deposit LDP, no suitable/additional sites have been identified.

8.4 The progression of the LDP through to examination allows this issue to be more thoroughly explored. Discussions have already been initiated with the Welsh Government to progress a balanced approach to addressing needs for the South East Wales region. Furthermore, it should be noted that policy H8 provides a criteria-based policy to assess any future sites which may come forward over the plan period so the plan clearly has mechanisms to effectively consider future sites. Potential new opportunities will continue to be investigated should they arise and, subject to timescales, could inform the examination process.

8.5 The consideration of the provision for Gypsy and Traveller needs on a South East Wales scale may require further consideration. A continuation of the current situation would result in future provision limited to those Authorities who have

catered for needs in the past whilst other (and often adjoining) Authorities technically will have no future needs to meet at all as there is currently no provision. This is considered an unreasonable and unsustainable approach. Future dialogue regarding strategic planning options for South East Wales including the upcoming consultation from the Wales Government on the Draft Planning Reform Bill and Consultation Paper may offer an opportunity to further explore this matter. The future consideration of a more reasonable, sustainable and strategic approach is likely to have implications on how provision is addressed in Cardiff.

- 8.6 In response to comments raised in relation to flood risk in order to fully assess the precise nature of flood risk and explore effective mitigation measures in relation to the lifetime of development, a Phase 3 Flood Consequence Assessment has been undertaken in consultation with Natural Resources Wales. The findings of this study show that development of the site can meet TAN15 guidelines until 2085 with appropriate mitigation. Given this and the fact that flood risk does not become an issue until 2085 on this part of the unused land plus the fact that the Severn Estuary Strategy Management Plan is proposing sea defence improvements before this time, an allocation on this land is not unreasonable at this juncture.
- 8.7 With regard to comments relating to employment land it is important to note that the site and its surroundings have no planning status and have not been allocated for employment land. In addition the sites comprises only a small portion of the vacant land in this area (approximately 8%) and given this it is considered there are ample opportunities for expansion of the Celsa steelworks in this location if required in the future. Furthermore, there are strong reasons to support this allocation. This has the benefits of building upon the strong existing links with the existing community and facilities provided. Indeed, the site would benefit from far safer access to Willows High School and local services, overcome existing coastal erosion concerns and provide a more satisfactory living environment in a well-screened site not directly adjacent to the busy Rover Way. However, in view of related deliverability matters, dialogue will continue with the landowners in order to provide further clarity to the examination process.
- 8.8 In response to the comment relating to the site selection process it is important to note the independent study followed criteria set out in national guidance and all the sites considered were subject to thorough investigation and analysis.
- 8.9 There are strong reasons to support the proposed size of the site although it is acknowledged the site would be of a large scale in a Wales context and above recommended site size in national guidance. It is important to note the guidance also states that local authorities may consider it necessary to be flexible by allowing more pitches on a site when taking into account local circumstances and the current level of need. Furthermore, the Council's experience in operating the Shirenewton site of 59 pitches has demonstrated that large sites can be very effectively managed providing both benefits for the Gypsy and Traveller community and enabling the effective delivery of supporting services. The site allows for a logical phased development where pitches can be provided in a managed and orderly manner together whilst integrating the provision of supporting facilities.

- 8.10 In response to the minor changes suggested by consultees it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters. Therefore, the proposed changes are not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

9. Economy & Employment

- 9.1 The Deposit Plan makes provision for a range and choice of new employment sites for different types of employment and different geographical locations to effectively deliver the level of growth set out in the plan together with putting in place a framework to protect the role of existing employment land. This responds to Cardiff's role as the main economic driver in South East Wales.

- 9.2 Approximately 29 representations were made on economic and employment policies, of the comments made on this policy feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 35% (10) sought amendments to either the policies or supporting text;
- 21% (6) expressed support for the Plan;
- 21% (6) sought amendments to the boundaries of the protected employment areas;
- 14% (4) made general comments on the policies;
- 3% (1) Stated that additional employment land should be allocated in the Plan;
- 3% (1) Sought and additional retail allocation at Blooms garden centre; and
- 3% (1) Sought clarity on whether flood risk had been considered in defining the protected employment areas.

- 9.3 In response to comments seeking amendments to either the policies or supporting text it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters. Therefore, the proposed changes are not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

- 9.4 In response to those seeking amendments to the boundaries of the protected employment areas defined under Policy EC1 these have been defined on the basis that these areas display strong potential to continue playing an important economic role, whether this is to provide local employment on smaller sites within key neighbourhoods or whether the sites are more strategic in size, position and function. Given this the areas shown on the Proposals Map are considered appropriate and the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters.

- 9.5 In terms of flood risk it is acknowledged that some of these areas are within flood zones C1 and C2 however these areas comprise existing developed areas within the city which perform an important economic role and the flood consequences of any proposals to redevelop sites within

these areas can be assessed at the Planning application stage in accordance with guidance set out in TAN15 flood risk.

- 9.6 In response to the other issues it is considered sufficient evidence for the reasons behind the policies is set out in the Economic Background Technical Paper No. 4 and the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters.

10. Green Belt

- 10.1 The Deposit Plan seeks to strategically manage the future built form of Cardiff's urban area and designates an area as Green Belt on land north of the M4 in Cardiff. This land forms a distinctive, prominent and well known backdrop to the city forming a strategically important setting to the urban area. The land is also generally well contained by the strong physical boundary of the M4 Motorway to the south which is an important requirement of any designated Green Belt Area.

- 10.2 Approximately 95 representations were made on Policy KP3(A) which allocates land as a Green Belt north of the M4 motorway in Cardiff, of the comments made on this policy feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 69% (65) sought the inclusion of additional areas within the Green Belt including areas around Creigiau, north west Cardiff and east of the city near St Mellons;
- 18% (17) supported the Green Belt designation;
- 7% (7) sought the removal of areas from the Green Belt;
- 5% (5) sought the deletion of the Green Belt; and
- 1% (1) expressed concerns regarding the ability of the Green Belt to afford sufficient protection against development in the future.

- 10.3 In response to the comments received it is important to note that the Green Belt is designated to strategically manage urban form and protecting the setting of the urban area. The proposed designated area was subject to careful analysis and related to strategically important land with well-defined boundaries based on the distinctive green backdrop to the urban area. Importantly, extensions to the designated area are not considered appropriate and would run contrary to national guidance which, in recognition of the long-term permanence of Green Belts beyond the Plan period, would unnecessarily restrict future development options. Written supporting text to KP3(A) clarify this point and Green Belt Technical Background Paper provides further justification.

- 10.4 Overall, it is considered that this designation is appropriate for Cardiff and accords with national guidance relating to Green Belts as set out in Planning Policy Wales. Importantly, given the Plan proposes some significant greenfield releases, this Policy provides some longer-term certainty as to the future urban form of the city, It should also be noted that the land within a Green Belt should be protected for a longer period than the Plan period.

10.5 Furthermore, it is important to note that all other non-allocated land outside the Settlement Boundary is sufficiently protected by a range of policies in both the LDP and national planning policy. This protection provides a presumption against development during the Plan period (subject to material planning considerations).

10.6 Therefore, in the light of the above, there is considered no justification to either amend or delete the Green Belt and it is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to this matter. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

11. Protection of built and natural environment

11.1 The Deposit Plan sets out a range of policies relating to the protection of the built and natural environment. Natural assets are key to Cardiff's character, value, distinctiveness and sense of place and include the undeveloped countryside and coast, river valleys, biodiversity interests and trees. The Deposit Plan also aims to protect, manage and enhance Cardiff's distinctive heritage assets including the character and setting of its Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Historic Parks and Gardens, Conservation Areas, Locally Listed Buildings and other features of local interest that positively contribute to the distinctiveness of the city.

11.2 Approximately 85 representations were made on policies relating to the protection of the natural environment, of the comments made on this policy feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 36% (30) expressed support for the Plan;
- 28% (24) sought amendments to either the policies or supporting text;
- 20% (17) sought clarification regarding the intention of the River Valley policy;
- 7% (6) made general comments;
- 6% (5) sought changes to the boundaries of the River Valleys;
- 2% (2) stated the greenfield development proposed in the Plan was contrary to the aims of the natural environment policies; and
- 1% (1) sought changes to the Special Landscape Area boundaries.

11.3 In response to comments seeking amendments to either the policies or supporting text it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters. Therefore, the proposed changes are not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

11.4 In response to comments relating to the need to clarify the intention of the River Valley policy it is considered that the supporting text to the Policy provides the necessary clarity. In particular it is important to note that the Policy will be used as a mechanism to implement the Council's aims with regards to the river corridors and will be used in conjunction with the River Valleys Initiative and the River Corridor Action Plans for the Ely Valley, Taff Corridor and Rhymney Valley and Nant Fawr corridor. New

developments within, or adjacent to the river corridors may be required to contribute to projects which help to achieve the objectives set out in the River Corridor Action Plans.

- 11.5 In response to those seeking changes to the boundaries of the River Valleys the boundaries shown on the Proposals Map are considered appropriate and are based on areas of open space associated with the river which together form a strategically important corridor that runs through the heart of the urban area. Extensions into the countryside where boundaries would be difficult to establish are not supported.
- 11.6 Changes to the Special Landscape boundaries are considered inappropriate as these areas have been defined using the updated LANDMAP information methodology system established in 2003 which is recognised in Planning Policy Wales. They are designated to protect areas that are considered to be important to the overall landscape of the city.
- 11.7 In response to concerns relating to greenfield development it is important to note that policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on the Masterplanning approach. This approach shows how development can be managed, phased and all impacts mitigated including factors relating to the natural environment.
- 11.8 Approximately 11 representations were made on policies relating to the protection of the built environment, of the comments made on this policy feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:
- 36% (4) expressed support for the Plan;
 - 36% (4) stated Conservation Area Appraisals should be added to the list of SPG included in the Plan; and
 - 28% (3) sought amendments to either the policies or supporting text.
- 11.9 The comments relating to the need to include Conservation Area Appraisals on the list of SPG are noted but it is considered that the Plan itself meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to this matter.
- 11.10 In response to comments seeking amendments to either the policies or supporting text it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters. Therefore, the proposed changes are not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

12. Minerals and Waste

- 12.1 The Deposit Plan sets out a range of policies relating to minerals and waste. In terms of minerals the Deposit Plan aims to contribute to regional aggregate supplies by promoting and supporting the efficient use of minerals and use of alternatives, protecting existing mineral reserves and safeguarding potential resources from permanent development including sand and gravel resources, coal resources and limestone resources and

maintaining a 10 year land bank of permitted aggregate reserves in line with national guidance. In addition to this the Plan seeks to protect sand wharves within the Cardiff docks from development, sets out criteria for the preferred order of mineral resource release and includes policies relating to quarry closures and extension limits, mineral buffer zones and restoration and after-use of mineral workings.

12.2 Approximately 32 representations were made in relation to the 10 Minerals policies included within the Plan, of the comments made on this policy feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 54% (17) sought amendments to either the policies or supporting text;
- 31% (10) expressed support for the Plan;
- 6% (2) sought more clarity to explain decisions for identifying the sand and gravel and limestone safeguarding areas;
- 3% (1) objects to the proposed closure area identified at Creigiau quarry;
- 3% (1) states the limestone safeguarding area policy is too rigid and does not account for changing circumstances over the Plan period; and
- 3% (1) made a general comment.

12.3 In response to comments seeking amendments to either the policies or supporting text it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters. Therefore, the proposed changes are not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

12.4 In response to the other issues it is considered sufficient evidence for the reasons behind the policies is set out in the Minerals Background Technical Paper and the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters.

12.5 In terms of waste the Deposit Plan seeks to manage waste arisings in the city by promoting and supporting additional sustainable waste treatment facilities, encouraging the provision of in-building treatment facilities in existing areas of general industry, supporting the provision and maintenance of sustainable waste management and storage facilities in new developments and supporting waste minimisation and the provision of facilities that use recycled or composted products. Detailed policies allocate land for waste management purposes at Lamby Way, set out a framework for the assessment of planning applications for waste management facilities.

12.6 Approximately 20 representations were made in relation to the 4 Waste policies included within the Plan, of the comments made on this policy feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 40% (8) sought amendments to either the policies or supporting text;
- 20% (4) expressed support for the Plan;
- 15% (3) sought more clarity on the proposals for waste included in the Plan;
- 15% (3) sought the allocation of land at Ty-to-Mean Farm as a waste management facility; and

- 10% (2) made general comments on the Plan.

12.7 In response to comments seeking amendments to either the policies or supporting text it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters. Therefore, the proposed changes are not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

12.8 In response to the other issues it is considered sufficient evidence for the reasons behind the policies is set out in the Waste Background Technical Paper and the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for changes relating to these matters.

13. Flood Risk

13.1 The Deposit Plan includes a policy relating to flood risk which aims to avert development where it would be at risk from river, ordinary watercourse, coastal, surface water flooding or where it would increase the risk of flooding or additional run off from development elsewhere. The Policy reflects advice in Welsh Government Planning guidance TAN15 Flood Risk and helps deliver LDP objectives relating to flood risk.

13.2 Approximately 6 representations were made in relation Policy EN14 Flood Risk, of the comments made on this policy feedback can be summarised as follows using approximate percentages:

- 33% (2) expressed support for the Plan;
- 33% (2) made general comments on the policy; and
- 33% (2) stated further investigation on the impact of flooding due to increased water run-off from the proposed developments needed to be undertaken.

13.3 In response to the comments stating further work is required to assess the impact of the proposed developments on surface water run-off it is important to note that this issue will be carefully considered during the detailed master planning of the sites and at the detailed planning application stage to ensure any potential impacts are identified and appropriate mitigation and management measures included. Appropriate national policy guidance provides a sufficient context in terms of details in Technical Advice Notes to provide a sound basis for such detailed work and it would be inappropriate for the LDP to repeat national policy or guidance. Therefore, the proposed changes are not considered necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound.

List of Supporting Documents to be submitted to the Welsh Government for independent examination

1. Deposit Local Development Plan 2006 -2026 (including appendices and plans), September 2013
2. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Final Sustainability Report, September 2013
3. Local Development Plan Delivery Agreement (incorporating Community Involvement Scheme), December 2011
4. Consultation Report, May 2014
5. Copy of all representations made to the Deposit Plan and Alternative Site Consultation process
6. Statement of suggested main issues for consideration at the examination and a suggested procedure for dealing with them.
7. Schedule of Minor Changes, May 2014
8. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 1 Population and Housing – Updated May 2014
9. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 2 Urban Capacity Study – Updated May 2014
10. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 3 Green Belt – September 2013
11. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 4 Economic – September 2013
12. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 5 Transportation – Updated May 2014
13. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 6 Infrastructure Plan – Updated May 2014
14. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 7 District and Local Centres – September 2013
15. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 8 City Centre Protected Shopping Frontage Assessment – September 2013

16. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 9 Minerals – September 2013
17. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Background Technical Paper No. 10 Waste – September 2013
18. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Habitat Regulations Assessment Report, September 2013
19. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Health Impact Assessment Report – September 2013
20. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Equalities Impact Assessment Report – September 2013
21. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Master planning Framework – General Principles, Strategic Framework & Site Specific Frameworks for larger sites – Updated May 2014
22. Cardiff Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2026 Summary of cross boundary working – September 2013
23. Evidence base to Deposit Local Development Plan (various documents)