Summary of Cross-boundary Working

September 2013
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations used in the Report</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20\textsuperscript{th}: Session 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20\textsuperscript{th}: Session 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17\textsuperscript{th}: Session 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17\textsuperscript{th}: Session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17\textsuperscript{th}: Session 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes of Proceedings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20\textsuperscript{th}: Session 1 - Population and Household Growth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20\textsuperscript{th}: Session 2 - Economic Development, Employment Land &amp; Retailing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17\textsuperscript{th}: Points Arising from Discussions on January 20\textsuperscript{th} 2012</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17\textsuperscript{th}: Session 1 - Transportation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17\textsuperscript{th}: Session 2 - Infrastructure and Deliverability</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17\textsuperscript{th}: Session 3 - Environment</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPENDICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Collaborative Working Group – Terms of Reference</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary provided by LPA’s/Organisations on their strategies/roles</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agreed cross boundary evidence base to inform Cardiff LDP</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Scene setting” presentation for meeting on 20/1/12 and 17/2/12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Map of Cardiff showing constraints and candidate sites</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Bridgend County Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Caerphilly County Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Cardiff Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Cardiff County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Community Infrastructure Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWML</td>
<td>Great Western Main Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBF</td>
<td>Home Builder's Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP</td>
<td>Local Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Park and Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWEF</td>
<td>South East Wales Economic Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWSPG</td>
<td>South East Wales Strategic Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWTA</td>
<td>South East Wales Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINC</td>
<td>Site of Importance to Nature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Special Landscape Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Welsh Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLGA</td>
<td>Welsh Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRMP</td>
<td>Water Resources Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Wales Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>Welsh Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan County Borough Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Introduction**

1. Cardiff County Council is currently preparing its Local Development Plan (LDP)\(^1\). It intends consulting on the issues facing the City and its preferred strategy for dealing with and planning for those issues in November 2012, with a view to placing the LDP on deposit in October 2013.

2. The LDP will be submitted to the Welsh Government for examination by an Inspector from the Planning Inspectorate to determine whether the Plan is sound. The Inspector will be guided by the tests of soundness set out in *Local Development Plans Wales: Policy on Preparation of LDPs* (2005). Test CE1 requires, amongst other things, that where cross boundary issues are relevant, the LDP is compatible with the development plans prepared by neighbouring authorities.

3. In order to assist Cardiff County Council satisfy this test I was asked to chair a working group, made up of officers from the ten south-east Wales local planning authorities and other participating organisations in the South East Wales Strategic Planning Group (SEWSPG). The South East Wales Economic Forum (SEWEF) and the South East Wales Transport Authority (SEWTA) were also invited to participate. The purpose of the working group was to discuss the cross-boundary implications of the emerging issues involved in the preparation of the LDP. The terms of reference agreed by the working group are in Appendix 1.

4. An initial meeting was held on 8 November 2011 to draw up the terms of reference, to agree the evidence base relevant to cross-boundary issues, and to set the timetable for the work. A second meeting was held on 7 December 2011, at which the terms of reference were finalised, dates and timetables were agreed for the main discussion sessions, and the main issues for debate were established. The issues were discussed at round table sessions on 20 January and 17 February 2012.

5. This report sets out the essential points from those discussions, beginning with a summary of the essential outcomes and broad areas of agreement.

6. As specified in the terms of reference, this report does **not** make any policy recommendations.

\(^1\) A list of all abbreviations used in this report is on page 2 following the CONTENTS list
Summary

Friday 20 January: Session 1, Population, 10.00-12.45

7. The general agreed view was that, based on the evidence of need and in order to meet its vision, Cardiff should go for a level of growth at the higher level of the range set out in the Edge Analytics report. This would be between options A and B in the 2011 consultation. The neighbouring authorities recognise the benefits to them of a relatively high level of growth in Cardiff. They will provide for their own growth in their individual LDPs, and support a high level of growth in Cardiff to provide spin-off benefits for the region. In terms of the options in the 2011 consultation, the HBF support Option A as a minimum and tend toward higher levels, whilst the neighbouring authorities tend towards Option B.

Friday 20 January: Session 2, Economy, 13.30-15.00

8. All participants recognised the important role that Cardiff plays as a driver of the regional economy. The authorities in SE Wales recognised the benefits they derive from jobs growth in the City. All participants supported a high level of growth and no-one disagreed with the view put forward by many that this should be at the level of Option A for jobs growth in the 2011 consultation. It was pointed out that the number of jobs in Cardiff grew by 40,000 in the 10 years 1998-2008 and that a growth of 40,000 over the 20 year period of the LDP, 2006-26, was not wildly optimistic. It was noted that, in terms of sectoral growth, given the new impetus provided by the Cardiff Business District (CBD)/Enterprise Zone, jobs growth in Cardiff was likely to be predominately in the financial/professional services sector. By contrast, recent trends in the adjoining authorities had seen growth concentrated in the manufacturing sector. It was also agreed that the LDP had to plan for this level of economic growth and address the implications, specifically additional commuting into the city, essentially planning both for growth and its consequences.

Friday 17 February: Session 1, Transportation, 10.00-11.15

9. There was general agreement to CCC’s strategy of freeing up road space on the key arterial routes by intercepting cars in conjunction with P&R and P&S initiatives, thereby reducing car-borne commuter traffic. In respect of Cardiff’s focus on encouraging a modal shift, concentrating on bus transport, it was accepted that buses were more flexible in being able to link new areas developed in recent years that did not have convenient rail access. It was also noted that new developments in the City in future years were, similarly, likely to be in peripheral locations without ready access to the rail network. Whilst there was general support for this overall strategy, there was scepticism regarding the potential of bus services to provide the necessary solution to Cardiff’s transport problem, which was recognised to be a regional issue. The surrounding authorities therefore encouraged CCC to adopt an approach across all transport modes, including the train, which was considered by many to have greater potential if efforts were made to increase capacity. All the adjoining authorities were willing to work with Cardiff on initiatives aimed at encouraging modal shift and reduce car-borne commuting into the City, such as utilising under-used parking areas to provide P&R and P&S
facilities. Everyone present also agreed that the transport issues in Cardiff needed to be addressed on a regional basis that extended beyond the City’s administrative boundary.

Friday 17 February: Session 2, Infrastructure/Deliverability, 11.15-12.40

10. It was agreed that the cumulative impact of infrastructure and other financial demands on the viability of new development needed to be taken into account. It is clear that the necessary water and waste water infrastructure is being planned for and can be provided to meet the demands of growth in Cardiff up to and including Option A in the 2010 consultation, based on the WG 2008 household projections. Improvements to the waste water treatment plant in SE Cardiff will be needed to cope with growth both in Cardiff and other parts of the region (Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, western Newport). The position is being monitored by WW and they have plans to make the necessary capital investment at the appropriate time. Strategic flooding issues are a key constraint affecting employment land in the Wentloog area in particular; these issues are serious and cannot simply be addressed by contributions from additional development to improved flood protection. They would affect any proposals to provide P&R in this part of the City. Whilst it is clear from the discussion on the previous topic (Transportation – see paragraph 104 above) that road charging has the potential to make a significant contribution to the provision of transport infrastructure, both within Cardiff and the region, this is not being considered at present. CCC’s strategy is to change behaviour and secure a modal shift. Nonetheless, there was support for CCC to approach the WG to seek the finance required to provide the necessary infrastructure that would be required over the Plan period, particularly for transport. However, CCC is taking a pragmatic approach to reflect the likely availability of finance. It will develop a CIL Charging Schedule in conjunction with its LDP and there was strong support for CCC’s intention to use the CIL to fund major infrastructure improvements both in the City and the region.

Friday 17 February: Session 3, Environment, 13.30-1400

11. There was no support for the designation of areas in Cardiff as either Green Belt or Green Wedge. It was agreed that areas should be protected for their intrinsic value with an appropriate designation. There were areas designated as Green Wedge/SLA in adjoining authorities that needed to be reflected across the joint boundary. It was argued that it was necessary to look beyond the period of the LDP when considering what areas needed protective designations to avoid preventing future growth options. It was generally agreed that the river corridors in Cardiff needed protection.
January 20th 2012

Roundtable session 1: Population and Household Growth

12. The session commenced with a presentation by Cardiff County Council (CCC) setting out the background to the LDP preparation, including the approved vision and objectives; the environmental, social and economic context; the 3 growth options consulted on in May/June 2011; and the spatial options to meet those options.

13. The Home Builders’ Federation (HBF) stated that the study by Edge Analytics\(^2\) provided good evidence to support the need for growth in Cardiff. However, the view of the HBF was that the conclusions were not supported by the evidence contained in the report. The evidence in the report indicates that Cardiff needs to plan for a high level of growth. The HBF’s view was that Cardiff needs to grow both to meet its own needs and to stimulate the region and should therefore plan for Option A.

14. The Vale of Glamorgan County Borough Council (VG) expressed preference for growth option B as did the Welsh Government (WG).

15. Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council (RCT) expressed concerns relating to the robustness of the existing housing land bank in terms of the need to revisit density levels in view of the changed market conditions and the need to tackle long term vacancies in the existing housing stock.

16. Welsh Water (WW) stated that as part of their Water Resources Management Plan they were addressing water abstraction issues to 2034/35. WW has prepared plans to address the potential deficit in the supply of water in south-east Wales by 2028/29; these plans would cater for the high level of growth envisaged in Option A. However, a lower growth figure would provide some flexibility in planning for drinking water resources.

17. The WG stated that CCC would need to justify any deviation from the 2008 household projections. The report by Edge Analytics gave some justification for planning for a lower level of growth but Option C was not realistic; the only realistic options were A and B. If Cardiff wanted to be a world class European capital city, as envisaged in its approved vision for the LDP, it needed to go for a high level of growth. This would involve difficult choices but there were options available. Some were less realistic and involved environmental difficulties but there was land available in addition to the identified candidate sites.

18. CCC stated that they were aware of the scale of the need for housing, particularly affordable; they were also aware of the need to plan for economic growth. However, they also needed to balance growth with the constraints, including strategic flooding issues. It should be noted that including all candidate sites would be unlikely to deliver the level of growth envisaged in Option B.

19. The WG stated that the evidence of housing need suggests growth above Option B. If CCC was to plan for Option B and the Inspector concludes at the examination that a

\(^2\) Cardiff Local Development Plan: Population and Household Projections – Phase 2 Report, June 2011
higher level of growth is needed, Cardiff would need to have considered sites to meet a higher growth level. CCC could have consulted on a growth level higher than Option A.

20. CCC pointed out that this would imply an annual build rate in excess of 3000 units, whereas previously no more than 2,300 units had been achieved in a single year and this figure reflected a very high proportion of flats in healthy economic times. WG responded that CCC needed to consider the evidence and demonstrate if this was unfeasible.

21. The HBF stated that developers wished to build houses, particularly in Cardiff, which was an attractive area. There was capacity in the industry to expand but the LDP needed to be flexible. The key to increasing the annual build rate was the provision through the LDP of a range and choice of sites; there was no reason why the industry could not increase past build rates. The SEWSPG regional apportionment exercise had been a flawed process and had not reflected market realities.

22. WW stated that their current planning was on the basis of the higher level of growth in Option A. If higher levels of growth were required they would need to ask the regulator for agreement to secure funding for the necessary improvements.

23. Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council (MT) stated that they had gone for the highest level of growth they thought could be achieved and the Inspector had been satisfied by their evidence. The Council accepted that their growth was closely related to Cardiff and wished for it to go for growth levels of Option B. It accepted that growth in Cardiff would lead to spin-off benefits for the Valleys authorities.

24. RCT stated that they had benefited in terms of housing growth over recent years from Cardiff not having an up to date development plan. RCT had effectively provided housing for Cardiff. It favoured growth in Cardiff because of the benefits this would provide for RCT. However, they were concerned that the housing land bank in Cardiff would not be sufficient even to deliver Option C due to changes resulting from revised densities as a result of the recent housing market slump. In RCT’s view growth option C was preferred but listening to the debate this morning there was a compelling argument for Option B based on the evidence. There was a clear mismatch between Option C and Cardiff’s ambitions to be a world class European city as set out in its approved vision.

25. The HBF stated that development in neighbouring authorities had been specific to the areas closest to Cardiff, such as Llantrisant and Caerphilly. It was not realistic to expect development to go to areas such as Merthyr. Consequently, for spin-off benefits Cardiff needed to opt for higher levels of jobs growth to make it attractive; areas with close links to Cardiff would then benefit from that growth.

26. RCT and the HBF agreed that if high levels of growth were not planned for in Cardiff there was nothing to indicate that developers would look to the adjoining authorities instead. There was a strong possibility that they would look outside SE Wales to areas that had planned for growth, such as Bristol.

---

3 See also Appendix 2, page 33 for comments by Newport City Council who were unable to attend
27. Bridgend County Borough Council (BC) questioned the level of jobs growth in Option B. At 40,000 this equated to the growth in jobs in Cardiff in the 10 years from 1998-2008. Since Cardiff’s plan period was for the 20 years 2006-26, the evidence suggested that Cardiff should plan for a higher level of growth in jobs.

28. RCT pointed out the significant investment needed in the larger sites, which caused problems in their area because of the lower land values. In Cardiff several sites in the west of the city would need significant infrastructure investment. CCC responded that the larger sites gave greater potential, but conversely gave rise to larger infrastructure requirements. However, there was the potential for benefits to adjoining authorities as contributions could be used to share benefits across boundaries. RCT pointed out that any increased access to the A4119 would require improvements that would need to be funded.

29. The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) stated that the likely reaction of the neighbouring authorities to Cardiff would be not to suck all the region’s growth into Cardiff. Household and employment projections are sensible and the HBF members clearly can expand to deliver more housing. However, it appeared that households cannot get finance for house purchase. There is therefore the risk that development in Cardiff will be at the expense of other parts of the region, depressing house building numbers elsewhere.

30. The HBF responded that funding restrictions applied everywhere; it was not possible to assume the market will go to adjoining authorities if Cardiff were to restrict its growth. Demand was increasing and the mortgage indemnity guarantee scheme in England was proving a success; the WG was keen to do the same in Wales. The industry could increase construction to meet demand but the LDP could not respond to changed circumstances quickly. Current short-term problems should not be used to determine the longer-term LDP context.

31. The WG pointed out that as part of the LDP monitoring process some authorities may need to change their LDPs in the future if housing development does not take place as envisaged. If that is the case and authorities revise their housing figures downwards, this would in turn place pressure on Cardiff to provide housing growth.

32. In response to my question regarding the balance between the need to provide for housing growth and the wishes of the community, the WG stated that this revolved around how consultation was carried out. People needed to be asked how they wished to live their lives. Did they want jobs, houses, shops and facilities? Development and growth influenced house prices and affordability and Cardiff’s vision of being a European city required high levels of growth.

33. CCC pointed out that there were several constraints on the level of growth that could be achieved. There were flood risk issues at Wentloog; lack of access around St Mellons; environmental and strategic landscape setting issues on land north of the M4; there were few options left on land not identified as candidate sites.

---

4 See also Appendix 2, page 33 for comments by Newport City Council who were unable to attend
5 In the 2011 consultation 75% were opposed to greenfield development
34. RCT responded that if that was the case then Cardiff would have to accept that it did not have the capacity for the necessary level of growth to meet its vision. If it seriously wanted to be a European city it needed to find the sites.

35. The HBF stated that there may be landowners who do not know the potential of their sites and there were options to expand the candidate sites. It should be borne in mind that the candidate sites had been put forward by those owners with the ability to do so in terms of time and money.

36. The WG stressed the importance of the perception of Cardiff’s position. The past vision for the City had failed. The City needed to have open discussions about different levels of growth to encourage people to come forward with sites for development. The key was to achieve the vision in the Plan. The Edge Analytics report had set out a number of options and the WG considered that the correct level of growth was above Option B. It was for Cardiff to decide how it wished to achieve its ambition of being a world class European city. In addition, the housing land bank needed to be revisited to ensure it is robust in the changed housing market conditions.

37. In summary, it was agreed that based on the evidence of need and Cardiff’s vision, the general view was that Cardiff needed to go for a higher level of growth between Option A and Option B.

**Break 11.25-11.45**

38. In response to my question regarding the time and investment in infrastructure needed to open up major new greenfield sites, the HBF pointed out that the LDP covered a 20 year term. Major sites may not be brought on stream immediately, but some sites could be commenced with incremental provision of infrastructure. The LDP needed to provide the necessary flexibility.

39. RCT stressed that Cardiff must recognise that, if it were to adopt Option C, this would place significant pressure on the land banks of its neighbouring authorities. This could also occur were it to go for Option B since that pressure exists now and will continue to do so until Cardiff has an adopted LDP.

40. WW requested that the HBF relayed to its members that, if several developers with adjoining land were interested in development, they should work together. CCC confirmed that they had been having talks with the promoters of all the candidate sites and a number were already working together.

41. In response to my question about the deliverability of sites that had not come through the candidate site process, the HBF stated that there was a high level of demand for sites in Cardiff. However, it was important to properly evaluate the deliverability of all sites put forward in the LDP. The WG pointed out that in view of the long timeframe of the LDP it would be acceptable for some sites to be on a short timeframe for commencement, where deliverability had been demonstrated entirely, whilst others may take longer where there were greater development issues to be overcome.
42. RCT returned to the theme of development by volume house builders going outside the SE Wales region. The HBF stressed that expanding in the attractive areas around Cardiff would address that issue. The WG pointed out that Cardiff was competing with other cities in the Core Cities group and CCC needed to show leadership to ensure investment comes to Wales. The HBF pointed out that the region was Wales and the South West. RCT commented that Bristol was well on its way to being a European city.

43. In response to my question regarding the availability of finance to developers, the HBF confirmed that this was an issue where sites had been acquired prior to the economic downturn.

44. RCT pointed out that their modelling did not account for Cardiff’s growth. If development were to take place near junction 33 on the M4, more work would be needed to model the traffic impact on the M4 and A4119.

45. The WG stressed that Cardiff was the centre of the SE Wales region and the Capital of Wales. It therefore followed that the City had to be the engine for growth in the region. The WG and the HBF agreed that higher growth would provide commensurate funding from all sectors of the development industry to enable growth and infrastructure to be planned properly.

46. MT confirmed that they had planned for their own growth in their LDP but looked to Cardiff in these difficult economic times to provide growth in the region. They questioned what role there was for Cardiff Wales Airport to contribute to the growth of Cardiff and the region.

47. The VG confirmed that the strategy of their LDP, shortly to be placed on deposit, included the improvement of the links to the airport and the development of its surrounding employment land.

48. The WLGA stated that SE Wales depends on the success of Cardiff, but this did not inevitably mean that all development needed to be in Cardiff. Many city regions in other parts of the world are successful because they are linked to the surrounding areas. It was therefore necessary to recognise Cardiff’s role but not necessary to put all development here.

49. The HBF accepted that point but stressed that Cardiff was nowhere near the size it needed to be. Transportation linkages to the surrounding area were essential but development was also needed in Cardiff. The Wales Spatial Plan (WSP) sought to encourage a networked City Region.

50. The WLGA pointed out that a 40% growth in jobs in Cardiff would mean less elsewhere. It was necessary to improve connectivity. The HBF pointed out that these improvements needed both time and money; contributions from developers would pay for improvements.

51. CCC pointed out that there were huge areas of employment and housing land in the neighbouring authority areas that were not being taken up; the land was there but the market was not following.
52. Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council (BG) questioned whether the sectors that have seen jobs growth in the past would continue to grow in the future. The WG pointed out that it had dispersed public sector employment over recent years. The WLGA pointed out that the area that had seen the highest growth in recent years had been Merthyr, but this could not be replicated. The general view now was that the British economy needed to be rebalanced to expand the manufacturing sector. Cardiff’s strength was in the service sector and manufacturing strength lay elsewhere in SE Wales.

53. The HBF stressed that Cardiff was the centre for growth and that it would be wrong to restrict the city’s growth to try to force people to work and live elsewhere. The WLGA agreed that the City needed to be attractively networked and concentrate on financial services, but it was not properly networked at present.

54. CCC stated that the City needed critical infrastructure. Whilst more jobs could cause greater congestion, development would enable it to gain money for the wider good and address commuting problems.

55. The HBF stated that the LDP needed to deliver land where values would support provision of infrastructure and wider improvements. The Plan needed to be flexible in order to bring development forward.

56. CCC indicated that the LDP Preferred Strategy should give high level indications of the infrastructure needed to bring development forward and was seeking to be pragmatic in terms of the preferred strategy.

57. In summary, the general view was that, based on the evidence of need and in order to meet its vision, Cardiff should go for a level of growth at the higher level of the range set out in the Edge Analytics report. This would be between Option A and Option B in the 2011 consultation. The neighbouring authorities recognise the benefits to them of a relatively high level of growth in Cardiff. They will provide for their own growth in their individual LDPs and support a high level of growth in Cardiff to provide spin-off benefits for the region. In terms of the options in the 2011 consultation, the HBF support Option A as a minimum and tend to levels higher than this, whilst the neighbouring authorities tend to a level between Option A and Option B. There was also a recognition that Cardiff needed to be better networked in the region.

*Lunch 12.45 – 13.30*
January 20th 2012

Roundtable session 2: Economic Development, Employment Land and Retailing

58. CCC confirmed that the employment-led forecasts of housing and jobs growth in the Edge Analytics report were based on different economic activity rates. The options used in the 2011 consultation were similarly based on economic activity rates rather than policy proposals.

59. The HBF considered that the projections were not overly optimistic in terms of jobs growth.

60. SEWEF stated that it had no official position on the options put forward by CCC in its 2011 consultation. However, it confirmed that most growth in jobs had taken place in the coastal belt and Cardiff and, in its view, this was likely to continue. Cardiff’s CBD/Enterprise Zone would provide a new impetus for job creation in the city. The lack of take-up of employment land elsewhere in SE Wales was due to lack of interest; the land is available. SEWEF expects Cardiff to continue to grow and to be the driver for the region and hence supports Option A in terms of jobs growth. It should be noted that Cardiff had the smallest amount of employment land of the 10 SE Wales local authorities.

61. BG referred to the report commissioned by the Industrial Communities Alliance (Wales) that considered the relationship between the need for jobs in Cardiff and the means of transport to Cardiff. They agreed that the LDP should make provision for growth of jobs in Cardiff.

62. The HBF stated that the LDP needed to align employment and housing growth in Cardiff to minimise commuting. The WG supported the provision through the LDP of opportunities for people to live and work together. CCC confirmed that promoters of candidate sites had included an element of mixed use in their proposals, giving people the opportunity to live near their work.

63. RCT stated that their policy was to provide large employment sites but acknowledged that, if good transport infrastructure were available to enable people to commute into Cardiff, the Council could release employment land for housing. CCC could assist in funding transport improvements from development in the city.

64. BC, however, stated that this was a sectoral issue, as lower density manufacturing uses are best provided outside Cardiff. Consequently, they would not want to de-allocate any land.

65. WG agreed stating it was important to ensure co-ordination.

66. CCC pointed out that projections of high tide increases due to climate change had seriously affected the City’s existing industrial areas; further advice was being sought from the Environment Agency but it may no longer be appropriate to allocate some land for development. Consultants were carrying out further studies to establish whether

---

*Tackling Worklessness in Wales, Christina Beatty and Steve Fothergill, July 2011*
flood risk could be mitigated but there remained major questions over some sites. The Council was committed to developing sustainable options and was working on the strategic differences between the sites.

67. WG stated that it was important to quantify the scale/range of employment land needed in the City, including the contribution the CBD will make.

68. The Environment Agency (EA) stated that it was important to link the level of growth to the capacity for waste water treatment and waste management capacity.

69. SEWTA stated that most of the road network in Cardiff was at capacity. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would assist in providing funds for improvement, but money is scarce. It was essential that modal shift took place to provide additional capacity. Mixed uses were needed together with policies to reduce the need to travel by car and work on the strategic routes to create the conditions that would encourage less car use. Not many people travelled by train; electrification of the Great Western Main Line (GWML) was not due until 2017. Bus priority routes were the best way forward and offered the greatest scope for reducing car use. Park and ride provision at train stations and on the periphery of the city would be of wider benefit.

70. The HBF pointed out that it took 45 minutes to get into Cardiff City Centre from the suburbs. It was therefore necessary to align jobs and housing developments to reduce the need to travel.

71. SEWTA expressed the view that development plans had to drive change since the road networks were at capacity. Difficult decisions were needed to re-allocate road space so that it is quicker to get into the City by bus rather than the car. Road user charging was another way of tackling the issue, but this would need to be progressed outside the LDP process and would, if pursued, be a longer term option.

72. CCC pointed out that the use of buses in the suburbs of Cardiff represented only 5% of journeys. It was necessary to improve bus routes and timetables, provide park and ride facilities and demonstrate the benefits new development can bring.

73. MT pointed out that it was also necessary to make it easier for people to travel out of Cardiff; trains come in to the city full in the mornings and go out empty.

74. The WG suggested that it was necessary to look at different growth scenarios at different sites. CCC confirmed that the site assessment criteria took account of the available facilities near the candidate sites; this gave different results at the various sites.

75. The WG questioned whether it would be better to consider expanding a candidate site into a much larger area, rather than spreading development over several smaller sites, because of the economies of scale and the potential for much larger infrastructure works to be funded.

76. The HBF pointed out the difficulty of delivering a single large housing site. CCC stated that one large site would cause transport issues and would have implications for the adjoining authority. Whilst agreeing that some sites could be amalgamated or enlarged
to provide the necessary infrastructure, for the numbers Cardiff needed it would not be feasible to develop a single site.

77. SEWTA pointed out that there was no under-utilised capacity in the transport network. The LDP needed to focus on the existing areas, otherwise no-one would use the public transport system. Something drastic was needed to secure a modal shift; some 50% of people needed to transfer to public transport if Cardiff is to cope with the level of growth being considered. Both sticks and carrots were needed to secure that shift.

78. CCC confirmed that it was considering the potential contribution of park and ride facilities on the main routes into Cardiff and was talking to neighbouring authorities such as RCT about such schemes. There was a potentially wider benefit to Cardiff and its neighbouring authorities from such schemes through the resulting release of capacity in the network.

79. SEWEF confirmed that in its view Cardiff should be planning for the high level of growth and the HBF concurred, stating that there was a need to create rather than restrict opportunity.

80. The WG stated that employers will come to Cardiff and the LDP must therefore plan for growth. Otherwise development will occur by default without proper planning.

81. MT stated that whilst its LDP makes provision for jobs growth, the County Borough relies on Cardiff for employment opportunities, particularly in the current economic climate. It recognised that Cardiff will always play a major role in stimulating the regional economy.

82. SEWEF stated that each authority should concentrate on its best sites, ensuring it allocated a range and choice of attractive employment sites that were available for development. Cardiff needed to do the same, providing a range and choice across the board.

83. The HBF stated that on the basis of the available evidence Cardiff needed to adopt Option A for both jobs and housing growth. The WG advised that Cardiff should also think about the implications of not doing something, in this case of not planning for the necessary amount of growth.

84. In summary, all participants recognised the important role that Cardiff plays as a driver of the regional economy. The authorities in SE Wales recognised the benefits they derive from jobs growth in the City. All participants supported a high level of growth and no-one disagreed with the view put forward by many that this should be at the level of Option A for jobs growth in the 2011 consultation. It was pointed out that the number of jobs in Cardiff grew by 40,000 in the 10 years 1998-2008 and that a growth of 40,000 over the 20 year period of the LDP, 2006-26, was not wildly optimistic. In terms of sectorial growth, given the new impetus provided by the Cardiff Business District (CBD)/Enterprise Zone, jobs growth in Cardiff was likely to be predominately in the financial/professional services sector. Conversely, recent trends in the adjoining authorities had seen growth concentrated in the manufacturing sector. It was also agreed that the LDP had to plan for this level of growth in jobs and address the implications for additional commuting into the city, planning for growth and its consequences.
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Points Arising from Discussions on 20 January 2012

85. The WLGA pointed out that the mortgage indemnity guarantee scheme (para 27 above) had been launched in November 2011 and it was too soon to judge its impact. The HBF clarified that it had been referring to the ‘First Buy’ scheme, which guaranteed the deposit of first time buyers and had been a great success. The latest scheme was ‘New Buy’, which was to be launched in England in March 2012; Welsh Ministers were working to implement the scheme in Wales at the same time. The WLGA pointed out that this scheme, which guaranteed the mortgage on a new house, would need to be underwritten by the Welsh Government. The WLGA hoped the scheme would go ahead in Wales as it would break the deadlock in the housing market. However, whilst the risk of default would be low, there was a financial implication for Welsh Government as expenditure would have to be cut from other areas and given this the total amount of funds available would need to be capped. The HBF agreed, stating that the scheme would bring first time buyers into the market.

86. The Caerphilly County Borough Council (CBC), who had not been able to attend the previous meeting, expressed concern at the household projections, which could lead to over-allocation of sites. This would lead to greenfield sites being developed first with no development on brownfield sites. They argued that it would be easier and better to under-allocate land. The HBF strongly disagreed, arguing that it was important to get sites allocated in the LDP at the start as it would be more difficult to increase allocations at a later date. CCC pointed out that Cardiff’s LDP would include phasing of sites.

87. CBC confirmed that it had no concerns over the level of housing growth adopted in Cardiff’s LDP. Their main concern was in respect of transport, employment and economic growth and supported the level of employment growth in Option A (para 57 above). The HBF stated that it was important to recognise the spin-off benefits for Caerphilly of jobs growth in Cardiff. CBC accepted that Cardiff was able to attract jobs that other areas could not, but stressed the importance of the transport network to access those jobs.

88. CBC emphasised the need to consider the most sustainable locations for housing and employment growth, pointing out that it was quicker to travel to central Cardiff from some Valley towns than from parts of the City’s outer suburbs.

89. The WLGA agreed that the circulated summary of the 20 January session was a balanced account, but added that Wales needed to compete for high value manufacturing jobs, which would probably go outside Cardiff. There was also a need to broaden the base for employment growth, which had been concentrated in professional services in Cardiff in recent years.
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Roundtable session 1: Transportation

90. CCC began with an overview of the County Council’s strategic approach to Cardiff’s transport issues. Cardiff was a Sustainable Travel City, now in the third year of a 5 year plan that aimed to encourage a change in travel behaviour so that 50% of commuter trips would be by sustainable means. The philosophy was to take traffic from the key radial routes to enable re-allocation of road space for bus priority measures. The rail network also provided opportunities, so that people could walk or travel by bus to railway stations, giving an alternative to single occupancy car journeys. The Council had restricted long-stay parking in the City Centre to encourage people to switch travel modes. Initiatives to expand walking and cycling for people living close to the Centre had been successful.

91. In terms of the City Region, some 78,000 commuters travelled in to Cardiff daily with around 20,000 travelling out. There was little capacity on Cardiff’s roads in the peak periods, which had extended over recent years. But travelling outside the peak periods was not difficult. The strategy was to ensure that the key radial corridors were used for movement on sustainable transport modes. To do this it was necessary to intercept traffic before it got to Cardiff. Trains did not present a difficulty as they provided quick access in to the City, but buses presented a problem. Bus priority corridors were needed within the City, which extended into the wider region; these would have limited stops until they reached the City Centre to provide a reliable and efficient service. Park and Ride (P&R) was part of the strategy.

92. There was an inextricable link with jobs; employment areas needed to be located close to public transport corridors to provide choice. New housing areas needed to be planned around cycling and walking. New development presented opportunities to solve some of the existing problems, such as the lack of access to Cardiff Gate other than by car.

93. Working across boundaries was an essential part of the strategy. For example CCC was working with RCT to explore the potential for a Park and Share (P&S) site in Nantgarw, alongside the A470, using parking space that was under-utilised during the working day and on weekdays. If this proved successful then a P&R service could be added. The Council was looking to solve problems through collaborative working with other organisations such as SEWEF, SEWSPG and SEWTA.

94. RCT stated that it had identified P&R sites in its LDP and confirmed there were several opportunities for such schemes, including on the A4119 to tackle congestion issues on the M4.

95. CCC expressed the view that there were enormous opportunities to encourage modal shift in the region and discourage commuting trips by car into Cardiff. It was necessary to pursue all opportunities as the road network in the City was at breaking point. Car-sharing should also be seen as a sustainable form of transport.

96. The HBF stressed that it was necessary to shift away from the pattern of providing jobs in Cardiff, with high levels of in-commuting, by aligning jobs and housing growth in the City to get people to live close to where they work.
97. CCC accepted that additional commuting would worsen the current situation. The key question was the allocation of road space and pointed out that there was little regional bus movement into Cardiff. Dedicated lanes would enable easier bus movement. They pointed out that 70% of rugby supporters come into the City by public transport on international days; that pattern and attitude needed to be extended. The Bryn Glas tunnels on the M4 motorway at Newport were a bottle-neck, but the same number of people could get through the tunnels easily by bus. The Council considered it necessary to address both issues – the location of housing and the volume of commuting. Strategic cross-boundary solutions were needed.

98. CBC expressed scepticism, stating that many bus lanes did not work and this approach was simply tinkering with the problem. If Cardiff was to be a European City it needed vision. The idea of a Metro system had not been mentioned. New forms of transport were needed on new transport corridors; they would be expensive but they were needed. It was also pointed out that there was no rail station in East Cardiff. CBC’s priority was improvements to Queen Street station. In addition, P&R sites needed to be located as far out as possible from Cardiff’s boundaries.

99. CCC accepted that Cardiff was well-placed regionally to be served by rail and that the improvements planned for Queen Street station would be beneficial, but only 5% of commuters travelled in to the City by train. Whilst the need to widen travel choice was accepted, for example by providing additional stations, bus services were more flexible and cheaper to provide, particularly in the suburbs. Whilst the City was blessed by its historical legacy of rail transport, the comparative costs of rail transport and parking in Cardiff made the former uncompetitive.

100. The VG accepted the infrastructure costs and the barriers to improving the rail network and generally supported CCC’s strategy. However, they felt that there should be more concentration on P&R linked to rail routes in to the City. It would be difficult to expand bus routes into the surrounding region, for example through Penarth. CCC responded that it was difficult to find space for P&R facilities at many stations. The VG stated that there was plenty of capacity to expand rail travel but there remained a perception problem of bus travel and public transport in terms of comfort and reliability. People were willing to put up with the delay on the roads.

101. CCC pointed out that the sum available for the SEWTA area for 2011/12 was £8m in total, making it difficult to have a significant impact because of the consequent incremental approach to providing new systems.

102. The VG asked what the balance of investment was in Cardiff and suggested that it may be more sustainable to focus on P&R and train stations. RCT pointed out that rail travel was restricted and inflexible. The problem for Cardiff was that much of its growth had been on the periphery, where there was no convenient access by train; the potential growth areas were similarly located, potentially exacerbating the situation.

103. CCC accepted that the Metro project had the potential to link everything. This was based on the idea of a bus network linking the stations on the Valley railway routes, with additional links, possibly including rapid transit, where these were needed. Cardiff had started applying this principle by extending its bus services to link areas of the City Centre with the Bay and Central station. But lack of integrated ticketing was a problem.
104. RCT pointed out that Cardiff faced a continuing transport problem for the next 20 years because of the level of growth being proposed in the City. CCC stated that this was the reason road charging had first been considered. This had the potential to raise considerable sums of money that could be spent to improve transport infrastructure. The current strategy of pursuing a switch to public transport was cheaper, but if the pressure continued it might be necessary to consider road charging as a demand management tool to encourage a modal shift.

105. The WLGA pointed out that it was not possible to plan to end movement; it was not a problem for Cardiff alone. There were ¼ million commuter movements across boundaries in the region as a whole. Connectivity therefore needed to be built into all LDPs in the region. In their view the restraint on increased train travel was capacity – some would tolerate a third world service but most would not. If the capacity of the train services could be increased this would have an impact.

106. CCC agreed, but stressed that both capacity and price would need to be tackled. They added that RCT was correct regarding the location of housing development in Cardiff in the past 10 years and its inconvenience for train travel, but also questioned whether housing allocations in the RCT and Caerphilly LDPs were close to train stations; if not, commuting into Cardiff by road would increase.

107. RCT confirmed that some of its housing sites were convenient for public transport, but that people could not be forced to use it. Employment sites had been allocated to meet needs within the authority’s boundaries, but it was not possible to ensure its residents worked on those sites rather than travel in to Cardiff.

108. CBC emphasised the importance of protecting transport routes and pointed out the problems of looking beyond the period of the LDP when seeking to do so; it would be necessary to look forward 20-30 years. Opportunities to reinstate some train services had been lost because former routes had not been safeguarded and had now been developed.

109. CCC accepted that the region had to be more connected. However, the Council needed to establish a strategy within its LDP that could stand scrutiny before an Inspector, linking transport with land allocations that were deliverable.

110. In terms of transport, CCC’s view was that it was necessary to make public transport reliable and cheaper than the car, but there would be significant cost and deliverability hurdles to overcome regarding major infrastructure works. Their strategy therefore was to re-allocate road space on the key radial routes into the City. The potential impact was shown by the fact that 800 buses would carry the same number of passengers as 40,000 cars. It was necessary to take a pragmatic view of what could be delivered and apply the lessons of how Cardiff operated when major events were held in the City.

111. The HBF questioned why anyone would use the train when it cost more than travelling by car. RCT pointed out that the train saved time and could save money.

112. CCC emphasised that the main benefits to the region lay in expanding use of buses since the major potential sites were not served by public transport. Nevertheless, they accepted that it was necessary to explore all options, including schemes that had operated successfully on the continent, for example in Stockholm. New development presented the opportunity to plan areas to allow for choice and allow dedicated bus
routes. They pointed out that the cost of fuel was itself having an impact and more people were now choosing to leave their cars at home, but there was still a need for behavioural change. School holidays took some 10-15% of cars off the road, which had a significant impact on ease of travel by car. CCC was itself trying to set an example and influence behaviour by guaranteeing parking for 4 days a week only for staff, requiring them to use public transport on the other day.

113. RCT pointed out that it was possible to secure planning gain from new development, which could be used for example to provide bus passes for occupiers of new housing developments, presenting them with choice. CCC agreed, adding that it was likely parking in new housing areas would need to be controlled in conjunction with such measures, which provided alternatives to using the car.

114. The HBF stated that people will always want 2/3 cars; stopping them parking outside their houses was not the answer and would not stop commuting. It was necessary to improve public transport so that people had a viable alternative.

115. CCC pointed out that the cost of travel would carry on increasing. Many different initiatives could be taken to encourage a change of behaviour; the final strategy needed to be a mix of them all. New neighbourhoods needed to be planned to provide access to public transport and give residents a choice. It was not sensible that Pontprennau did not have a primary school; a new school was required to reduce the need to travel. Car sharing needed to be recognised as an alternative to public transport. But there was also need to apply parking guidelines in the face of pressure from key developers who expected parking to be provided well above the standard; the fact that Cardiff was a retail destination exacerbated the pressure.

116. CBC pointed out that east-west public transport links in the region were virtually non-existent; travel by public transport was almost wholly in and out of Cardiff along the Valley routes. The EA stressed the importance of ‘greening’ transport corridors.

117. CCC emphasised the need for new bus services in the City. Presently all services end up in the City Centre; new east-west services were needed. If cars could be removed from the core network new bus services could be provided. To do this, it was necessary to look at a transport corridor in its entirety and be able to offer certainty for passengers. Bus use in the suburbs of Cardiff was very low, but it would be possible to use new development to help fund new strategic corridors to improve existing services.

118. In response to my question regarding the acceptability of using new development to address existing problems, the HBF pointed out that new development could provide funding that would help improve capacity on an existing commuter route.

119. CCC emphasised the need to collaborate with neighbouring authorities, pointing out that the WG recognised the need to plan beyond the City’s boundaries to address its transport problems. The Sustainable City initiative was proving successful in securing modal shift but the road space that was being released must not be taken up by extra regional car movements. This required collective work by all authorities in the region.

120. SEWEF agreed, emphasising that this was a regional issue that needs a regional solution; it goes beyond Cardiff.

121. In summary, there was general agreement to CCC’s strategy of freeing up road space on the key arterial routes by intercepting cars in conjunction with P&R and P&S initiatives,
thereby reducing car-borne commuter traffic. In respect of Cardiff’s focus on encouraging a modal shift, concentrating on bus transport, it was accepted that buses were more flexible and deliverable in being able to link new areas developed in recent years that did not have convenient rail access. It was also noted that new developments in the City in future years were, similarly, likely to be in peripheral locations without ready access to the rail network. Whilst there was general support for this overall strategy, there was scepticism regarding the potential of bus services to provide the necessary solution to Cardiff’s transport problem, which was recognised to be a regional issue. The surrounding authorities therefore encouraged CCC to adopt an approach across all transport modes, including the train, which was considered by many to have greater potential if efforts were made to increase capacity. All the adjoining authorities were willing to work with Cardiff on initiatives aimed at encouraging modal shift and reduce car-borne commuting into the City, such as utilising under-used parking areas to provide P&R and P&S facilities. Everyone present also agreed that the transport issues in Cardiff needed to be addressed on a regional basis that extended beyond the City’s administrative boundary.

*Break 11.15-11.45*

\[7\] See also Appendix 2, page 33 for comments by Newport City Council who were unable to attend.
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Roundtable session 2: Infrastructure and Deliverability

122. In terms of deliverability, CCC stated it was looking at the region as a whole, particularly in terms of the transport issues. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be used outside Cardiff’s administrative boundaries on schemes which would have a demonstrable impact upon the city’s transport system. It was looking to develop its CIL Charging Schedule in parallel with its LDP and anticipated the two would be examined together.

123. The HBF emphasised that infrastructure solutions for a particular site can resolve problems for the existing community. However, it was important to be aware of the cumulative cost of the many demands imposed on new development and to recognise the impact on viability. CCC agreed, adding that it was necessary to make sure people did not have too great an expectation of CIL.

124. The HBF pointed out that without the necessary transport improvements there would be no development. CCC responded that only £8m had been allocated for 2011/12 for the whole of the South Wales region; it was therefore necessary to be pragmatic as no bottomless pit of finance was available. For example, the Eastern Bay Link in Cardiff would cost £3-500m but it would be possible to get a significant modal shift without spending this amount of money.

125. CBC emphasised that Cardiff’s LDP was a 15 year plan. The transport issues needed to have bold solutions such as rapid transit; for example, a new link to Llantrisant could also serve the potential development areas in the west of the City.

126. The VG emphasised that other infrastructure would be needed such as new schools. CCC stated that a pragmatic approach was needed.

127. CBC stated that it particularly supported electrification of valley lines and improvements to Queen Street station. It urged CCC to approach the WG to secure the funding for the necessary transport/infrastructure investment required over the 15 years of the LDP.

128. SEWEF pointed out that if all the transport budgets of the authorities in the region were aggregated this would provide the Valleys Metro proposal; it was a matter of priorities.

129. The HBF stressed that, whilst short-term pragmatism was fine, longer-term solutions were also needed. It therefore supported the need for CCC to approach the WG to provide the funds required for infrastructure.

130. RCT questioned whether CCC had a figure for the infrastructure needed or any figures for the CIL Charging Schedule. It pointed out that the Council would need to demonstrate that its LDP was affordable and deliverable. CCC replied that there were a number of ways to consider CIL in terms of policy and, as previously stated, it could be used outside Cardiff’s administrative boundaries.

131. CBC pointed out that the critical parts of the Metro network are those that aligned with the potential growth areas. Growth needed to be located in sustainable locations so that it could be served by public transport. They questioned whether road charging had now been ruled out.

132. CCC responded that this was a high risk strategy and questioned how it would be possible to convince an Inspector that the LDP was deliverable if it were based on road
charging. It accepted that road charging had great potential, but it was not being considered at present. The strategy now was to seek a modal shift, which had already produced encouraging results. It was noted that the WG wished future finance bids to be linked to the Valleys Metro concept, so that schemes would improve access to Cardiff’s CBD, which was located at a national transport hub. The challenge was to decide the strategic priorities across 10 local authorities.

133. SEWEF asked whether there was enough employment land in Cardiff to deliver its growth. CCC responded that range and choice was also important. The EA stated that the key constraint was flooding in Wentloog. The timetable for the flood risk management strategy was not in line with the LDP timetable; in any event the strategy was to safeguard existing development. There was an impact in terms of the Water Framework Directive, which the EA hoped would be assisted by the LDP. The flooding problems would rule out P&R at Wentloog and all employment development in the area would be problematic. The EA also referred to the Local Evidence Pack it had just produced, which contained evidence on a regional basis and for individual authorities.

134. CCC confirmed that it would need to consider the costs of developing in the areas at flood risk and consider whether there should be any land allocated in these areas.

135. WW stated that they were in the process of preparing solutions for the water resources requirements in the region in conjunction with the WG; their Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) extends to 2034-35. They were confident of being able to cope with all demands of future growth in Cardiff and the region. Turning to waste water, the treatment plant in south-east Cardiff dealt with a population of some 880,000 in Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, western Newport and Cardiff. There was a need to look at the long-term implications of the growth planned for these areas. Investment would be needed and building rates were being monitored so that the necessary investment could be included in the appropriate 5 year capital programme. There was an expectation that the private sector would handle much of the necessary infrastructure, but it would be necessary to consider the implications of water and sewer requisitioning and ensure the additional capacity was provided. Some infrastructure schemes would be self-financing but in other cases they would need to be supported by the developer. It should also be recognised that some of the areas being considered for development in Cardiff have no infrastructure at all. The current capital programme extended to 2015 and the timing of the LDP was important; it needed to reach deposit stage to enable the Regulator to have some certainty in respect of future capital bids.

136. The EA emphasised the need to focus on water supply and water resources and referred to the importance of the Water Cycle Study. RCT commented that SEWSPG had agreed to progress such a study on a regional basis.

137. WW confirmed that they had used the WG household forecasts to 2008 in their forecasts, and so their WRMP would cater for the anticipated levels of growth.

138. The VG asked whether the improvements to the Cardiff waste water treatment plant would have any implications for the phasing of development. WW replied that they would now be looking at the needs in the 5 years beyond 2015; there was no question of preventing development in Cardiff. They had been using the Joint Housing Land

---

8 CCC stated that they would circulate the Local Evidence Packs to the Group for comment
Availability Studies, their own information and LDPs, both deposit plans and those at earlier stages, to calculate the capacity requirements. It was sometimes difficult because of the alternative sites that appeared during the LDP process.

Lunch 12.40-13.20

139. Before dealing with the next topic, the VG raised the regional role of Cardiff Airport, stating that their LDP made a strategic employment allocation at the airport. The LDP proposed a phased approach to development at the airport and to the development of strategic rail links. CCC agreed that the role of the airport was an important regional issue with implications for SE Wales as a whole. The VG pointed out the governance implications; it was necessary to bring many parties together to progress the necessary improvements to strategic transport links to the airport.

140. In summary, it was agreed that the cumulative impact of infrastructure and other financial demands on the viability of new development needed to be taken into account. It is clear that the necessary water and waste water infrastructure is being planned for and can be provided to meet the demands of growth in Cardiff up to and including Option A in the 2011 Strategic Options consultation, based on the WG 2008 household projections. Improvements to the waste water treatment plant in SE Cardiff will be needed to cope with growth both in Cardiff and other parts of the region (Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, western Newport). The position is being monitored by WW and they have plans to make the necessary capital investment at the appropriate time. Strategic flooding issues are a key constraint affecting employment land in the Wentloog area in particular; these issues are serious and cannot simply be addressed by contributions from additional development to improved flood protection. They would affect any proposals to provide P&R in this part of the City. Whilst it is clear from the discussion on the previous topic (Transportation – see paragraph 104 above) that road charging has the potential to make a significant contribution to the provision of transport infrastructure, both within Cardiff and the region, this is not being considered at present. CCC’s strategy is to change behaviour and secure a modal shift. Nonetheless, there was support for CCC to approach the WG to seek the finance required to provide the necessary infrastructure that would be required over the Plan period, particularly for transport. However, CCC is taking a pragmatic approach to reflect the likely availability of finance. It will develop a CIL Charging Schedule in conjunction with its LDP and there was strong support for CCC to consider using the CIL to fund major infrastructure improvements which would have a demonstrable impact on the city’s transport system.
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Roundtable session 3: Environment

141. CCC opened the session with an overview of the environmental issues that would need to be considered. The only Green Belt (GB) in Wales was on parts of the boundary with Newport, to prevent coalescence of the two settlements. In the previous deposit LDP a Green Belt had been proposed north of the M4, but was it needed? If a GB was required, what should be its extent, or was it more appropriate to designate a Green Wedge, which was slightly less restrictive? What areas should be designated as Special Landscape Areas (SLA)? Possible candidates were the Garth Mountain, the Caerphilly Ridge, the Wentloog Levels and St Fagans. There were European protected sites in north Cardiff and the Severn Estuary, where there were water run-off issues; there were water abstraction issues associated with the Usk River. The City had an extensive network of ‘green’ infrastructure including the three river valleys and several strategic open space corridors.

142. CBC pointed out that the geography of the City to a large extent provided the necessary protection where it was needed. A GB is intended to check urban sprawl and was only relevant between Cardiff and Newport. Caerphilly Mountain was important as much for its amenity and recreation value as its intrinsic merit; designation as GB would prevent some of the development that was important to that recreational use, such as the stabling associated with horse riding. Many areas of Cardiff needed to be protected for their intrinsic value and the GB was not an appropriate policy tool in such areas; some parts of designated GB had no particular merit and were only protected to prevent development and maintain openness. It was also pointed out that the SLA designated by CBC on Caerphilly Mountain needed to be reflected on the Cardiff side of the administrative boundary.

143. CCC agreed, emphasising the potential of Caerphilly Ridge as a recreational resource and the opportunity it presented to promote all forms of recreation, particularly horse riding. They also stressed the recreational importance of Cardiff’s parks. In addition, footpath trails had been developed along the river corridors as part of strategic trails linking with the wider region. CBC supported the need to protect the river corridors.

144. The HBF accepted the need to protect Caerphilly Mountain but argued that it was necessary to consider carefully which parts of the City needed protection to ensure that the LDP allowed scope for future development. Some long term designations would restrict future growth options.

145. The VG asked whether CCC would prefer that Newport did not designate a GB in its LDP. CCC stated that they had no view on this; the City was already built virtually up to its boundary with Newport and that the GB provided a strategic belt. The VG stated that Cardiff needed to expand in other directions.

146. CCC stated that they were considering the strategic options affecting those areas where the City had space to grow. There were other constraints and issues, including minerals, aquifers, SSSI and local biodiversity areas.

147. The VG pointed out that there was a Green Wedge at Leckwith where there was also an SLA. CCC confirmed that they were aware of the Green Wedges at Leckwith and Dinas
Powis. These had been designated jointly with the VG using consistent methodology based on LANDMAP and developed by SEWSPG.

148. The VG commented that they had experienced problems developing some brownfield sites where there were Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC); ecological issues had caused difficulties in developing at Barry Docks.

149. CCC confirmed that they had similar issues on a number of sites; there were around 150 SINC s in Cardiff. The Countryside Council for Wales was now focussing its attention on the larger, strategic sites as these were easier to mitigate. It was more difficult to carry out mitigation on smaller biodiversity sites. Wentloog presented particular challenges because of the number of designations and hence potential impacts.

150. The EA stressed the need to link green corridors to those designated in adjoining authorities.

151. In summary, there was no support for the designation of areas in Cardiff as either Green Belt or Green Wedge. It was agreed that areas should be protected for their intrinsic value with an appropriate designation. There were areas designated as Green Wedge/SLA in adjoining authorities that needed to be reflected across the joint boundary. It was argued that it was necessary to look beyond the period of the LDP when considering what areas needed protective designations to avoid preventing future growth options. It was generally agreed that the river corridors in Cardiff needed protection.
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Roundtable session 4: Review

152. No further issues were raised in the final session, which amounted to a brief overview and summary of the previous sessions.
APPENDIX 1

Collaborative Working Group – Terms of Reference

1 Background

1.1 Extensive work, dialogue and consultations have been undertaken over the past year to inform the preparation of Cardiff Council’s Preferred Strategy. Significant issues are emerging that go right to the heart of the plan. It has become clear that these issues demand further analysis and discussion so that the Preferred Strategy can be prepared in a sufficiently robust manner to meet the tests of soundness.

1.2 Many of these issues have clear cross-boundary implications such as levels of growth, transportation, economic development and the delivery of strategic infrastructure. Cardiff Council is therefore being proactive in initiating dialogue with the wider region to progress its LDP. This work is necessary for Cardiff Council to be able to demonstrate at the Examination that it has sought to effectively work with its neighbouring authorities to meet the relevant tests of soundness regarding cross-boundary matters.

1.3 There is a need to progress this dialogue apace so that Cardiff Council can follow its proposed timetable. There is also a need for the collaboration to be structured, robust and include the appropriate range of interests in order to satisfy the LDP tests of soundness. To help achieve these objectives, there is clear merit in utilising an independent Chair with a full understanding of these matters together with the reputation, neutrality, experience and skills to secure and facilitate the necessary engagement.

1.4 Whilst there is a pressing need to carry out this work for Cardiff’s LDP without delay, further collaborative working at a regional level is likely to be necessary in the future. This work is likely to take place over a longer timescale but work on informing Cardiff’s LDP can feed into this wider process.

1.5 The proposed process for undertaking the dialogue relating to Cardiff’s LDP is set out below.

2 Purpose and Objectives

2.1 The Group will discuss key strategic issues which will inform the preparation of Cardiff’s Preferred Strategy. To avoid any delay in its preparation the work must be completed by the end of February 2012. A staged approach will therefore be adopted covering the following topics:

(i) Discuss the appropriate level of information from the wider city-region which should form part of the evidence base to inform Cardiff’s Preferred Strategy. To include identifying relevant, robust and up to date data sources relating to land use planning, economic development, transportation and infrastructure;
(ii) Discuss and identify the scope of key strategic issues that have clear cross-boundary implications and will thereafter be subject to more detailed dialogue in part (iii) below; and
(iii) Discuss the identified key strategic issues with the aim of gaining a full understanding of areas of agreement and disagreement.

2.2 The output of this dialogue will be a paper prepared by the Chair summarising discussions held/ information gathered during the process along with an outline of areas of consensus and areas where there is disagreement, explaining the reasons underlying differing views. This will be invaluable in helping Cardiff Council fully address relevant city-region issues in the preparation of its Preferred Strategy, thereby helping to demonstrate meeting relevant tests of soundness. The paper will be disseminated to all participants to check for accuracy.

3. Membership

3.1 A copy of the paper setting out key findings will be sent to the Chair the South East Wales Strategic Planning Group (SEWSPG) to circulate to the Group.

3.2 Representatives on the Group are requested to ensure that any work that they are tasked to complete is undertaken in accordance with the agreed timescales that are determined by the Group. Additionally representatives are encouraged to both express their views but also to seek consensus wherever this may be possible.

3.3 Involvement in the Group will be open to Officers from the 10 local authorities within South East Wales and other participating organisations in SEWSPG. Representatives of SEWEF and Sewta will also be invited to participate. A formal request to participate will be sent to the Chair/Director of these Groups along with the offer of directly attending any meetings to explain the process and/or present findings.

3.4 It is for the individual organisations to nominate an appropriate representative(s) to attend meetings of the Group and to respond to requests for information and other requested inputs. Organisations are free to send different representatives to different meetings.

4 Meeting Chair

4.1 In order to ensure the collaboration is structured, robust and includes the appropriate range of interests the Group will use an Independent Chair with the experience and skills to secure and facilitate the necessary engagement. The Independent Chair will aim to seek out and understand views on agreed issues; to develop consensus; and identify areas where there is agreement and disagreement. The role will not involve making policy recommendations.

4.2 Discussions have taken place regarding this role with John Davies, formerly Director for Wales for the Planning Inspector. He has confirmed that he is prepared to accept this role and is considered to possess the necessary qualities.
5 Timetable

5.1 In order that the work can properly inform the emerging Preferred Strategy the work of the Group must be concluded by the end of February 2012.

5.2 Given this, a staged approach is therefore proposed as follows:

- November 2011: Discussion on regional evidence base to inform Cardiff’s Preferred Strategy - Cardiff Council will circulate regional data gathered to date and seek views on this;
- December 2011: Scoping key issues- Agreeing the scope of discussions in the next stage; and
- January/February 2012: Discussion on key issues.

5.3 Dates of meetings will be circulated in the near future.

5.4 Information for each meeting will be sent to all organisations in SEWSPG, the Director of SEWEF, the Chair of the Sewta Directorate, the Sewta Central Support Unit, and the Welsh Government transport planning team for wider circulation. This will give participants the opportunity to discuss issues prior to attendance.

6 Reporting Mechanism

6.1 Actions from each meeting will be produced and circulated within 5 working days and will be circulated to all organisations in SEWSPG, the Director of SEWEF, the Chair of the Sewta Directorate and the Sewta Central Support Unit for wider circulation.
APPENDIX 2

Summary provided by LPA’s/Organisations on their strategies/role

1. Rhondda Cynon Taf Local Development Plan: Spatial Strategy in a ‘nutshell’

**Context:** Rhondda Cynon Taf is the second largest Local Authority in Wales, it covers an area of 424 square metres with a population of 231,946 (2001). Strategic transportation links with the wider region are provided by the M4, A470 and A465.

**Core Strategy:** The Rhondda Cynon Taf LDP strategy is a hybrid strategy which provides development in locations that meet local needs whilst promoting sustainable growth. The core strategy advocates a different approach for development in the north and in the south of the County Borough. The strategy for northern Rhondda Cynon Taf places an emphasis on the need to build sustainable communities and halt the process of depopulation and decline. Development proposals in the Northern Strategy Area will provide appropriate growth to address the problems of deprivation and high levels of social and economic need.

In the south of the County Borough the emphasis is on sustainable growth that benefits Rhondda Cynon Taf as a whole. Development proposals in the Southern Strategy Area will promote sustainable development by providing a managed form of growth which will consolidate existing settlement patterns; have regard to the social and economic function and identity of settlements and the surrounding countryside; address existing or potential capacity needs to provide necessary infrastructure and reduce the need to travel.

Within these two strategy areas the LDP strategy will recognise the important role settlements play in providing homes and services of both local and county importance. In order to support and reinforce the important role these centres play as places for social and economic activity new development opportunities will be focused in the principal towns of Pontypridd, Llantrisant / Talbot Green and Aberdare and in the 8 key settlements of the County Borough.

A range of sites have allocated for the development of new housing, employment and retail facilities throughout Rhondda Cynon Taf. Large-scale Strategic Sites, which are capable of accommodating significant development, have been identified in locations that maximise the opportunities for sustainable regeneration and ensure a step change in the economy of the County Borough. Smaller non-strategic sites intended to meet local needs have been allocated in sustainable locations that reinforce the role of Principal Towns and Key Settlements.

**Key Policy:** Policy areas central to the delivery of the core strategy include;

- The provision of 14,385 new dwellings, which includes 1770 affordable homes;
- The development of 51 hectares of land for B1, B2 and B8 use to meet strategic employment needs and 47 hectares of land for B1, B2 and B8 local employment needs;
- The development of between 34,400 and 36,400 m² (net) of new retail floorspace, and
- Improvements to the strategic highway network which require the implementation of 4 new highway schemes.
2. Summary of Merthyr Tydfil's Local Development Plan Strategy

The Merthyr Tydfil Local Development Plan is based on an enhanced growth strategy which aims to reduce current levels of out-migration from the County Borough so that the population stabilises by 2011 and then grows significantly over the remaining 10 year period.

The strategy distributes growth over three areas: the Primary Growth Area comprising of the northern sector communities of Pant, Dowlais, Penydarren, Golan Uchaf, Gurnos, Swansea Road, Heolgerrig, Cefn Coed, Twynyrødyn, Town Centre, Georgetown, Abercanaid and Pentrebach; the Secondary Growth Area comprising of the southern sector communities of Edwardsville, Treharris, Trelewis and Quakers Yard; and the Other Growth Areas comprising of the mid valley communities of Troedyrhiw, Aberfan, Merthyr Vale and Bedlinog.

The Primary Growth Area reflects the fact that the main Merthyr Tydfil settlement has the best prospects for sustainable growth and the majority of development is focussed in and around this area. This will allow the area to expand its role as a hub settlement so that it acts as a key driver for regeneration within the Heads of the Valleys sub-region. The majority of housing and employment sites, as well as higher order retail and social facilities, are located within this area.

The Secondary Growth Area allows for limited further growth within extended settlement boundaries and the Other Growth Areas are limited to developments which sustain the integrity and vitality of existing settlements. Proposed development within these areas primarily consists of housing and lower order facilities which serve local needs.

3. Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (Adopted November 2010)

Pressure for development, the availability of suitable sites, the willingness of the private sector to invest, the sensitivity of the environment and the basic transport and service infrastructure vary widely across Caerphilly County Borough. The adopted LDP reflects this fact and seeks to guide development within a broad strategic framework based on three strategy areas as follows:

- Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area (HOVRA);
- Northern Connections Corridor (NCC);
- Southern Connections Corridor (SCC).

Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area (HOVRA);
The HOVRA is characterised by the highest levels of unemployment, social deprivation and population loss and has difficulty attracting private sector investment. However in recent years the HOVRA has attracted significant levels of public sector investment, particularly in its transportation network. The Plan seeks to exploit and build on this investment and therefore designates land for a variety of uses to reflect the role and function of those towns and villages within the area and also to act as a catalyst for inward investment and regeneration over the plan period. To date, significant investment has been targeted at Bargoed, which is the Principal Town in the HOVRA with the aim of elevating the status of the town within the wider Heads of the Valleys Region.

Northern Connections Corridor
The NCC comprises a contiguous area of urban development spanning the mid valleys area. The settlement pattern in this area is more like a conventional urban conurbation rather than
the traditional linear settlements typical of the south wales valleys. The NCC has two complementary centres at its core, namely Ystrad Mynach (containing the Council Headquarters, the new district general hospital, the college for further education and the police) and Blackwood (the area’s major retail centre). It also includes one of the largest employment sites in the valleys, namely Oakdale Business Park. The NCC has been successful in attracting substantial public and private investment that has succeeded in transforming this part of the county borough in recent years. In particular there has been significant investment in the transportation network in the area, which affords good road access to the northern part of the NCC and to the HOVRA. In addition the opening of the Ebbw Valley Railway and the new rail halt in Newbridge connects the eastern part of the NCC to the wider regional rail network, increasing the attractiveness of this area.

**Southern Connections Corridor**
The Principal Towns of Caerphilly and Risca lie in separate river valleys, and therefore although both are part of the SCC, they do not form a single conurbation like in the NCC. As Cardiff and Newport have become more successful, Caerphilly and to a lesser extent Risca have experienced increased development pressure. Whilst there is a need for both towns to capitalise on their proximity to the Cities there is also a need to ensure that these areas do not over-heat to the extent that negative environmental effects of over-development outweigh economic progress. The priority and emphasis in this area is on the redevelopment of existing brownfield sites.

**Future Development Needs**
In balancing the need for future development against the need for conservation, the LDP targets new development in line with the aspirations of the development strategy that underpins the plan as follows:

- Dispersed strategy (no strategic sites);
- 10,269 houses - distributed across the county borough;
- 964 affordable houses delivered directly through the planning system – accommodated on allocated housing sites;
- 101.9 hectares of new employment land – mainly at Oakdale and Ty Du Nelson (NCC);
- 29.3 hectares of commercial sites – located in 5 Principal Towns and 2 Retail Parks;
- A network of community facilities including leisure, education and waste facilities.

In addition it protects and safeguards land which is valuable in terms of:

- Nature Conservation e.g. Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation;
- Landscape Value e.g. Special Landscape Areas and Visually Important Local Landscapes;
- Preventing existing towns and villages from merging – Green Wedges;
- Leisure and Community Facilities from competing land uses;
- Ensuring valuable resources are not sterilised e.g. minerals such as coal;
- Reducing the threat of flooding to properties in the County Borough.

**Key objectives for Caerphilly in relation to Cardiff’s LDP**

1) Provide and protect a diverse portfolio of employment land for a variety of employment uses across the City, focussing in particular on higher value employment opportunities and sites to meet both local need and the needs of the wider region accessible by public transport from Caerphilly county borough.

2) Accommodate realistic and sustainable levels of population and household growth that makes sufficient provision to meet Cardiff’s need but which does not undermine the development strategies of neighbouring authorities through over-allocation.
3) Reduce congestion by concentrating new development in appropriate locations along existing and proposed public transport routes; minimising the need to travel through the co-location of land uses, promoting more sustainable modes of transport and making the most efficient use of the public transport infrastructure.

4) Develop a hierarchy of retail district centres that have regard for and complement the role of the Key Settlements in the wider region and the prominence of the City Centre as a Key Retail Destination.

5) Encourage the development of high quality, all season tourist and leisure attractions and tourist accommodation to attract visitors to the region.

6) Protect the land to the north of the M4 as green wedge to complement the SLA and VILL in Caerphilly CB and to ensure that the setting of the City is protected from inappropriate development.

Other considerations

7) Protect and enhance the overall quality of the historic and natural and built environment of the City.

8) Reduce the impact of flooding by ensuring that highly vulnerable development is directed away from areas of risk wherever possible.

9) Encourage the development of an efficient public transport network.

10) Identify and protect land that could be used to provide new public transport corridors that link to neighbouring local authority areas.

11) Encourage the re-use and reclamation of appropriate brownfield and contaminated land and prevent the incidence of further contamination and dereliction.

12) Consolidate development to within the existing urban area where this is appropriate and where greenfield release is necessary ensure that the sites are well located in terms of the existing or proposed public transport system.

4. Newport LDP Note for Cardiff LDP Collaboration

Newport’s LDP Preferred Strategy was published in January 2010 and is available at http://www.newport.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/plans_and_strategies/cont447341.pdf

The strategy is essentially a brownfield strategy, but that does not mean that it relies heavily on the development of flats and apartments. By way of illustration, the largest site, Glan Llyn (the Llanwern Regeneration Site) is one of the largest regeneration sites in Wales, and is intended primarily for family housing - about 4,000 dwellings in total. House building on the site has recently commenced.

The Preferred Strategy followed the Welsh Government 2006 based projections, which resulted in a build rate of 640 dwellings per year. The Deposit Plan has not yet gone to Council, but will do so shortly, and is likely to take the more recent and lower figure from the 2008 based projections for the first 5 years of the plan (2011-16), but reverting to the higher assumptions of the 2006 based projections thereafter (2016-26). This applies an element of market realism to the strategy, reflecting the lower level of activity in the house building sector in the current difficult trading conditions, but assumes that conditions will improve over time.
Newport has a good overall housing land supply. The adopted UDP includes a Growth Strategy, with the main element being the Eastern Expansion Area, including the Llanwern Regeneration Site, and which amounts to over 5,000 dwellings in total. There are also extensive regeneration sites within the urban area, many of which have planning permission, and some of which are partly complete. This gives Newport the ability to accommodate growth, matched to a generous supply of employment land. This is further seen as supporting the major retail redevelopment scheme proposed for the city centre, for which a developer has been appointed. Pressure for growth due to constraint in adjoining areas would not therefore be an immediate cause for concern to Newport.

The need to maintain the separate identity of settlements is seen as significant, and the Preferred Strategy retains, and slightly extends, the existing Green Belt west of Marshfield and Castleton, which was designated in the adopted UDP.

(Newport City Council was unable to attend the meetings of the Working Group on 20 January & 17 February and provided the following comments on the summaries.)

Paras 20, 21

There needs to be recognition of the impact of the current economic situation on levels of house building activity in both the private and social housing sectors. Both sectors are finding their levels of activity constrained by many factors, including availability of development finance. The private house building sector is also affected by low levels of consumer confidence and market activity, which in part reflects low levels of first-time buyer activity, which is constrained by high levels of deposit required, resulting in a rising average age of first-time buyers.

The evidence of current market realities needs to be reflected in any projection. Any assumption that completions in the first 5 years of the plan will be even at, let alone above, average past rates would not appear to be consistent with the evidence. Thereafter, it may be hoped that the economy will be moving out of recession, but build rates are currently well below average in Cardiff. Projections therefore need to be structured if they are to be presented as reasonable and achievable.

Paras 23-30

Some of the housing pressures that spill over from Cardiff into adjoining areas do so because of the lower house prices there. It is important therefore that Cardiff makes adequate provision in order that its house prices are not inflated by a restriction of supply, creating further outward pressures. Given the long lead in times for many of the sites being considered, early action to bring them forward may be required, and in a variety of locations to avoid any artificial restrictions of supply that could raise prices.

Newport does have a relatively good supply of land available for housing, and is in a position to supply some of the wider needs of the region. The projections in the Deposit LDP take the 2008 based WG projections for the period 2011-16, but then revert to the more optimistic (in Newport’s case) 2006 based projections for the period 2016-26, which assume some in-migration. The land supply identified in the Deposit LDP is more than sufficient to meet this need, in fact making over-provision.
The transport and infrastructure topics are recognised for their significance. There are clearly issues at present, and major development will need to make robust, positive and sustainable provision, and as part of a consistent overall strategy.

5. Bridgend County Borough Council LDP Strategy

In order to achieve the Vision and Objectives of the LDP Bridgend County Borough Council will follow a **Regeneration-Led Spatial Strategy** that incorporates a level of growth for the County Borough which broadly balances the housing and social needs of the existing and future population with that of the economy and the environment.

**Focused Regeneration**

The regeneration-related activities in the County Borough are widespread and the deliverability of some of these could be enhanced and secured in whole or in part by directing new development to specific areas. Taking into account the spatial distribution of regeneration activities and needs, development is directed to settlements and parts of the County Borough which will benefit the most and where there are opportunities for securing the greatest positive impacts and benefits of growth.

In line with the above, **four Strategic Regeneration Growth Areas** (SRGAs) at:

Bridgend; Porthcawl; Maesteg and the Llynfi Valley; and The Valleys Gateway

together with **four Strategic Employment Sites** at:

Brocastle, Waterton, Bridgend; Island Farm, Bridgend; Pencoed Technology Park, Pencoed; and Ty Draw Farm, North Cornelly

have been identified which, collectively, will deliver a range of mixed-use developments and facilities, the implementation of which will contribute significantly to fulfilling the LDP Vision and its Objectives.

**The LDP Strategy:-**

- requires development to be distributed according to the Regeneration-Led Sustainable Development Spatial Strategy;
- requires all development to meet Sustainable Place Making criteria;
- requires all development to meet Strategic Transport Planning Principles;
- requires the protection of sites and buildings of acknowledged natural, built and historic interest;
- safeguards areas of aggregates and coal resources;
- seeks to meet the County Borough’s contribution to regional and local waste facilities;
- requires that the County Borough contributes towards the country’s renewable energy requirements;
- identifies and protects 164 hectares of vacant employment land;
- directs new retail and leisure development to the town and district centres of the County Borough;
- encourages high quality sustainable tourism;
• requires 9,000 market (including 1,308 affordable) dwelling units to be accommodated in the County Borough during the LDP period 2006 – 2021;
• requires the retention of existing community uses and facilities and seeks to develop new ones, where they are needed;
• requires new development to be accompanied by an appropriate level of infrastructure

6. Monmouthshire Deposit LDP 2011-2021

SPATIAL STRATEGY

The Strategy will aim to disperse development around the County while focusing on those locations that provide the best opportunities for achieving sustainable development.

The Strategy proposes:

• An emphasis on the three main towns of Abergavenny, Chepstow and Monmouth, where environmental and infrastructure constraints allow.
• Some development at settlements in the Severnside area which provide opportunities for regeneration and infrastructure improvements.
• An appropriate amount of development in rural areas with a focus on those settlements that have best access to services and public transport.
• Residential growth to take place in association with opportunities for mixed use development schemes particularly in Chepstow and Monmouth.

• The towns of Abergavenny, Chepstow and Monmouth are the County’s most sustainable settlements, where there is the greatest potential for reducing the need to travel due to the co-location of houses, jobs, shops, services, community facilities and public transport. Caldicot is also a substantial settlement, although less well established than the historic ‘Three Towns’, particularly in its retail offer.
• There is also a need to ensure that some housing development is provided in the Severnside area to meet the needs of the existing population, particularly for affordable housing, to generate some developer contributions to assist in providing community facilities and employment infrastructure and to take advantage of the area’s strategic location at the ‘Gateway’ to Wales with good access to the employment markets of Newport, Cardiff and Bristol.
• The LDP also reaffirms existing employment allocations in the Magor area, which are in strategic locations close to Junction 23A on the M4 and could have regional significance.
• Some development is also proposed in rural areas, particularly to provide affordable housing to meet local needs, although LDP policies also allow for an appropriate amount of enterprise in rural areas, seeking to sustain and enhance and, where appropriate, regenerate the County's rural settlements.
HOUSING PROVISION

- Provision will be made to meet a need for 4,000 residential units in the plan period 2011-2021. It accommodates the level of growth indicated by the 2008-based Welsh Assembly Government Household projections, which project an increase for the County of 3,969 households between 2011-21 (or about 4,100 dwellings), with a small allowance (10 dwellings per year) to be met in that part of Monmouthshire included in the Brecon Beacons National Park.

- This level of growth also helps achieve the ‘Regional Collaboration’ growth option of 350 dwellings per year, which reflects the regional apportionment agreed amongst the members of SEWSPG and on which the LDP Preferred Strategy was based. While the LDP period begins in 2011, the base date for the regional apportionment was 1st April 2006. The adopted Monmouthshire UDP allowed for a range of 240 to 300 dwellings per year between 2006 and 2011. Due to the adverse economic climate the actual level of growth for the five years 2006-11 has been 236 dwellings per year. In reality, therefore, the rate of growth required to achieve the regional apportionment is around 400 dwellings per year over the LDP period 2011-21.

- The need for new housing allocations can generally be met by single strategic sites in the County’s larger settlements of Abergavenny, Caldicot/Portskewett, Chepstow, Monmouth and Magor/Undy.

7. Environment Agency

In relation to Local Development Plans, we aim to be influential in spatial planning matters to help achieve development that protects and enhances the environment. The LPA will need to gather information about its area to understand the issues and opportunities it can tackle. It must also set a baseline against which it can measure the effectiveness of the plan by monitoring information and setting itself targets. We can help in this by providing data and information about other plans and by helping it develop the right objectives for the plan.

Please find copies of our position statement with regard to ‘Sustainable Communities’ and our report ‘Hidden Infrastructure: The pressures on environmental infrastructure (2007)’ ([http://publications.environmentagency.gov.uk/epages/eapublications.storefront](http://publications.environmentagency.gov.uk/epages/eapublications.storefront)).

Our Hidden Infrastructure Report and the supporting policy messages contained within our Sustainable Communities Position Statement, recommend four ‘pillars’ for sustainable growth:

- Get the location of new housing right
- Joined-up and long-term approaches to planning
- Improve resource efficiency, reduce demand for drainage, and greater flood resilience
- Secure funding for environmental infrastructure early

We need to make sure that our environmental infrastructure (water; waste; wastewater and flood related infrastructure) can cope with increasing development. We aim to ensure, through Local Development Plans, that development is built in the right place, reduce demand, increase capacity (where needed) by building new infrastructure and extending old, and adopt sustainable approaches to environmental infrastructure.
The Environment Agency provided the following comments following circulation of the summaries

In looking forward, we recognise a key challenge for your Local Authority in the preparation of its LDP will be to balance the objectives of your Strategy, minimising the sustainability impacts arising from increased population and employment growth, and manage the accompanying social, economic and environmental changes, including adapting towards climate change and managing risks of flooding. We will be supportive of a Strategy;

- which strives to be sustainable and advises how key environmental constraints may be addressed through the Plan;
- which adopts of a precautionary approach in terms of flood risk, directing development away from areas of high flood risk hazard; and also takes into account that the management of flood risk and consequences (including the Wentloog Levels) must be acceptable;
- which in accordance with government guidance advises that previously developed (or brownfield) land should, wherever possible, be used in preference to Greenfield sites;
- which aims to protect and enhance the natural built environment. We are supportive of a strategic approach to Green Infrastructure (GI), which performs multiple functions and benefits including, flood risk management; water management (surfaces for infiltration and storage); habitat creation (river corridors) and recreation (boating, angling). Please refer to our draft advice note and comments with regard to Green Infrastructure sent previously (a further copy attached). We suggest that you consider the links between GI and water cycle studies (WCS), which will contribute to the aims of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). We note and welcome that SEWSPG has agreed to progress a regional WCS. Please note that we may be able to provide further expertise and offer further assistance;
- which seeks to manage the water environment as a whole. The overarching aim of the WFD is to achieve an integrated system of water protection, improvement and sustainable use. All aspects of water, including water quality, quantity and flow (surface and groundwater), water supply and capacity, wastewater treatment and flood risk should be considered. Their impact on biodiversity interests is also relevant;
- which acknowledges that suitable water and wastewater infrastructure must be provided (and/or phased) in the Plan period to ensure the delivery and viability of development options. We have been reassured with comments made by Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water (DCWW) at the Group meetings that based on Welsh Government household forecasts of 2008 their Water Resource Management Plan would cater for anticipated levels of growth; and that there are a number of options which may be employed to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place. We would also wish to be assured through an evidence based approach that there is no adverse environmental impact as a result of proposals or measures imposed;
- which identifies that where environmental concerns cannot be overcome then such development options should not be taken forward (options are not viable and/or deliverable).

We would expect that all options and sites to be assessed against environmental criteria and taken forward only where they has been assessed as being suitable.
For the attention of James Clemence

21 November 2011

Dear Sir

Cardiff LDP Collaborative Officer Working Group

I refer to the inaugural meeting of the above group on 8th November 2011 and the subsequent action on us to identify our main objectives in relation to your Local Development Plan; which are:-

1. to support sustainable economic development.
2. to plan and deliver the timely provision of water and sewerage infrastructure (subject to financial constraints).
3. to ensure that LDP policies safeguard a water company’s interests.

An explanation of each of the objectives is provided below.

To support sustainable economic development for the area.
We fully support economic development for Wales and firmly believe this needs to be sustainable. Our Water Resources Plan identifies the long term sustainability for water resources and our Draft Plan is currently out for public consultation. This Plan outlines our 25 year strategy for managing water resources and maintains the balance between supply and demand for water to the period 2034-35. Our Plan utilises Welsh Assembly Government population forecasts and whilst the Environment Agency Wales have indicated major reductions to our abstraction licences, we have identified options to ensure that the security of water supplies across Wales is maintained.

The Review of Consents, under the Habitats Directive particularly affects our abstractions from the rivers Wye and Usk. These rivers form a fundamental part of our South East Conjunctive use System that supplies the Cardiff area and our water resource zone will be in deficit sometime between now and the year 2035. We have
therefore identified solutions which will protect water supply and the environment through changes in our operations. We do not believe therefore, that these licence reductions should impact in any way the proposals for additional growth identified within your LDP.

In terms of the provision of water supply and sewerage, once the exact location and density of proposed allocations are confirmed, it may be a requirement for off-site water mains and sewers to be provided to the boundary of and within the development site. This is typical of a water company’s requirement in safeguarding security of water supplies and sewerage services to existing customers whilst at the same time allowing new developments to be served. These services can be acquired through requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).

With regards sewerage, the Cardiff area is well served with public sewerage and following the legislative change on 1st October 2011, all private gravity sewers for your LDP area were transferred into Dwr Cymru Welsh Water ownership. Sewage Pumping Stations and associated foul rising mains (i.e. pumped system) will follow by no later than 2016.

In periods of extreme storm events, flooding can occur and in order to improve the integrity of the public sewerage system DCWW applies for funding every 5 years to undertake capital improvements. Therefore a developer can either wait for DCWW to resolve through its planned Regulatory Capital Investment Programme or if development wishes to progress in advance of such investment, then developers can requisition new sewers or the necessary improvements. The mechanism of a requisition and financial implications allow for the cost of any solution to be offset by the income generated from the development over a period of 12 years and therefore potential developers would contribute the shortfall or where the income generated is greater than the scheme cost, would not contribute at all.

Our Cardiff Waste Water Treatment Works, the largest in Wales treats foul flows from not only the Cardiff area, but also properties in the Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Newport (in part) and Rhondda Cynon Taf local authority areas. Therefore, the total future growth from these local authorities need to be considered alongside Cardiff’s projections.

in the rural areas to the west of the county, DCWW has a number of smaller WwTW which by virtue of their size have limited capacity. If growth is planned for these areas, then assessment is required to understand whether constraints may apply.

To plan and deliver the timely provision of water and sewerage infrastructure (subject to financial constraints).
Every five years DCWW submit its business plan for approval to Ofwat, the Water industry Regulator and these plans are subject to scrutiny and challenge by other key stakeholders before the Final Determination is announced. The end result is that our Plan has to be affordable to customers as it is customers’ annual charges that primarily fund our Capital Investment.

Therefore, there is disparity between the LDP’s 15 year time horizon and a water company’s Business Plan which is regulated on a 5 yearly cycle. Equally so, as our Plan has to be affordable there may be circumstances whereby a shortfall in funding may exist for certain capital improvement. In these circumstances, we would look to work with local authorities and developers in establishing and concluding planning obligations to meet this shortfall; to allow developments to proceed.
To ensure that LDP policies safeguard a water company's interests.
We would expect your LDP to include Policies on the following topics.

- Infrastructure provision (as a Strategic Policy).
  - We would expect your Authority to release land for development
    where adequate water and sewerage infrastructure exists or is
    capable of being delivered.

- Foul sewerage and/or Sewered areas.
  - Developments should in the first instance connect to main sewers
    where it is feasible to do so otherwise the provisions of Welsh Office
    Circular 10/99 may apply.

- Surface water drainage.
  - The Flood & Water Management Act 2010 places obligations on new
    development. The removal of surface water from combined sewers
    can increase the capacity available for development.

- Sustainable drainage
  - The Flood & Water Management Act 2010 places obligations on new
    development. The tackling of surface water at source can alleviate
    flooding.

- Water efficiency and/or conservation.
  - Appropriate standards of the Code for Sustainable Homes and
    BREEAM should apply as a minimum.

- Planning obligation
  - Planning Obligations and Planning Conditions can enhance the quality
    of development and enable proposals to go ahead which might
    otherwise be refused. Where development creates a need for extra
    facilities, in advance of an Undertaker’s Regulatory Investment, it may
    be reasonable for developers to meet or contribute towards the cost of
    providing such facilities.

- Protection of water resources (surface water and groundwater) and the
  environment – as the following activities could have a detrimental
  effect - mineral working, waste disposal, borrow pits, intensive
  livestock/poultry farms.
  - DCWV abstract 98% of its water from rivers and 2% from
    groundwater sources to provide (after treatment) potable water to
    customers. Any potential for derogation of such sources should be
    avoided, as the costs, inconvenience and operational problems are
    inconceivable.
Please be advised that we are also researching our records on sewer flooding and water connections, and details of these will follow shortly.

Our sewer flooding records will assist you in understanding where there are pinch points on the public sewerage system and dependant on where allocations are proposed, then these flooding issues may need to be resolved prior to any development proceeding.

Our records of annual water connections to properties may assist you in comparing datasets you may hold on house build rates.

I hope the above will assist you in the preparation of your LDP.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Ryan Bowen
Development Planning Manager
APPENDIX 3

Agreed cross boundary evidence base to inform Cardiff LDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Boundary Evidence Base to inform Cardiff LDP – Finalised List as at 9th January 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. ‘Core’ Welsh Government Policy Documents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advice Notes and Circulars (WG, Various)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Household Projections Briefing Note (WG, November 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note submitted to Cardiff Gypsy and Traveller Scrutiny Exercise on Local Development Plans (LDPs) Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (WG, November 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Welsh Government Datasets

The Welsh Government hold a wide range of useful data on the StatsWales link below:
http://wales.gov.uk/topics/statistics/theme/;jsessionid=KYdhTxfSppvVINv6GLJv4hDc2cStsQf29mJrhShGF4hQjR8xsNL!-1883660344?lang=en

Topics include:

3. Regional Strategies & data sets

Regional Transport Plan (Sewta, 2010)
http://www.sewta.gov.uk/regional-transport-plan

Outline Regional Transport Plan (issues and objectives report) (Sewta, 2007)
www.sewta.gov.uk/regional-transport-plan

Sewta Rail Strategy Review and Roll Forward Study (Sewta, 2011)
www.sewta.gov.uk/other-documents/sewta-rail-strategy/

Regional Waste Plan 1st Review (SEWRWG, 2008)
http://www.walesregionalwasteplans.gov.uk/pdfs/sw_pdf/SWW_RWP_1st_Review_August08.pdf

Aggregates: Regional Technical Statement (SWRAWP, 2008)

South East Wales Development Strategy ‘Enter the Dragon Economy’ (SEWEF, 2005)
SEWEF 2011 Employment Land Assessment Report (SEWEF, 2011) and any relevant previous studies
http://sites.google.com/site/sewaleseconforum/strategy

SE Wales Regional Housing Apportionment Memorandum of Understanding (SEWSPG, 2006)
http://www.cardiff.gov.uk/content.asp?nav=2%2C2870%2C3139%2C3154%2C3954

The South East Wales Regional Housing Market Study Final Report (SEWRHF, 2005)

Guidance on Preparing Affordable Housing Viability Studies (SEWSPG, 2009)

The South Wales Strategic Tourism Framework (Blue Sail, 2008)

Strategy for the Severn Estuary Summary (Severn Estuary Partnership, 2001)
http://www.severnestuary.net/sep/publications/severn.html

South East Wales Projections Evaluation Paper (Final) (SEWSPG October 2009)

Habitats Regulation Assessment Toolkit (SEWSPG September 2008)

### 4. Other Agencies

Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan Review (SMP2) (Severn Estuary Coastal Group, December 2010)
http://www.severnestuary.net/secg/smpr.html

http://www.severnestuary.net/sep/publications/soser.html?dm_i=UXW,PO3G,5H6KB9,22IWK,1

Wye & Usk, Eastern Valleys, Taff & Ely and Ogmore to Tawe Catchment Flood Management Plans (Environment Agency)
http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/64223.aspx

Taff & Ely, Ebbw & Lwyd and Rhymney Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies (Environment Agency) – Likely to be revised in 2012

Industrial and Commercial Waste Arisings in Wales (Environment Agency -2007)
Environment Agency annual data reports on a breadth of waste topics, with the tables and supporting information are available at:


Hidden Infrastructure (Environment Agency, 2007)

A Metro for Wales’ Capital City Region (Institute for Welsh Affairs/ Cardiff Business Partnership, January 2011)

NB. Sewta’s Board formally adopted a report on the Metro proposal in September 2011; this and later reports can be found under www.sewta.gov.uk/the-board.


Draft Water Resources Management Plan (October 2011)
www.dwr cy mun .com

Flood risk: Development Advice Map (TAN 15)
http://wales.gov.uk/topics/planning/policy/tans/tan15/?skip=1&lang=en

Surface Water Flooding Maps (2nd Generation) (Environment Agency)

Tackling Worklessness in Wales (Industrial Communities Alliance (Wales) July 2011)
http://www.shu.ac.uk/_assets/pdf/cresr-tackling-worklessness-Wales-report.pdf

Long Term Development Strategy for Western Power Distribution (South Wales) plc’s Electricity Distribution System (Western Power, November 2010)
http://www.westernpower.co.uk/getdoc/4c01596f-5409-4a01-97b4-411c1ef859e4/LTDS_SWales_Nov10.aspx

Comparison of Local Authority LDP figures and the 2008 Household Projections (HBF, 2011).

Environment Agency Local Authority Based Evidence Packages which include data on flood risk, landfills and water quality issues. Regional Evidence Base Package for Cardiff and adjoining authorities in preparation. Can be accessed through InfoBaseCymru (http://www.infobasecymru.net: Choose Publications then Environment (Local Authorities only)) – Feedback welcomed.

5. Other Local Authorities

Caerphilly County Borough LDP (Adopted November 2010)

Torfaen County Borough Council LDP (Deposit Plan Written Statement March 2011)
http://www.torfaen.gov.uk/EnvironmentAndPlanning/Planning/ForwardPlanning/Publications/DepositLDP.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>LDP Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan LDP</td>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan LDP (Delivery Agreement Revised June 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf County</td>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough LDP (Adopted March 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent LDP</td>
<td>Blaenau Gwent LDP (Alternative Sites consultation July-August 2011, submission of LDP to National Assembly January 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend LDP</td>
<td>Bridgend LDP (Deposit July 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport City Council LDP</td>
<td>Newport City Council LDP (Preferred Strategy January 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth County Borough</td>
<td>Monmouth County Borough Council LDP (Deposit commenced October 7th – 18th November 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil County</td>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council LDP (Adopted May 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Housing Market</td>
<td>Local Housing Market Assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>* Cardiff and the Vale (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Caerphilly (December 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly County Borough</td>
<td>Caerphilly County Borough Council – Evidence Base Studies with Cross Boundary Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – Evidence Base</td>
<td>* Shoppers Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies with Cross</td>
<td>* Presentation by Roger Tanner entitled “Solving? The Planning Dilemmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Implications</td>
<td>of South-East Wales The A valleys Perspective.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taff County</td>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council – Evidence Base Studies Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>Boundary Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* EB81 -The Strategic Transport Corridors Infrastructure Needs(CD- ROM only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* EB38 Studies Assessment of Housing Requirements &amp; Delivery (NLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* EB39 -Employment Development Prospects &amp; Employment Land Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* EB41 -Employment Land Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* EB49 -Designation of SLAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* EB70 Retail Capacity Assessment Quantitative Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Cardiff Council - relevant work recently undertaken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for the Cardiff City Region</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cardiff.gov.uk/objview.asp?object_id=21155">Roger Tym &amp; Partners, October 2011</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map showing proposed development areas in LDPs in South East Wales</td>
<td>to be displayed at meeting on 8th November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual representation of comparative regional data sets</td>
<td>contained in other attachment to e-mail of 2nd November 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

“Scene setting” presentation for meeting on 20/1/12 and 17/2/12

Cardiff LDP Collaborative Officer Working Group: ‘Scene setting’ for meetings of 20/1 & 17/2

Presentation will be supplemented at the meetings by large scale maps and plans to assist in providing an overview and informing discussions

James Clemence, Operational Manager-Planning Policy, January 2012 (v.13/1)

Wales Spatial Plan

- “The area will function as a networked city region, on a scale to realise its international potential, its national role and to reduce inequalities”
- “A fully integrated high quality transport system is necessary for this to happen.”
- “The success of the area relies on Cardiff developing its capital functions, together with strong and distinctive roles for other towns and cities.”
- “Cardiff, Newport and the Valleys are interdependent. Only if SE Wales works as a networked city region of 1.4 million people will it have the critical mass to provide the quality of life for all appropriate for the 21st century and be able to compete with comparable areas in the UK and the EU for investment and growth.”

Wales Spatial Plan

- “At the heart of the vision is a network of strong, sustainable communities spreading prosperity from the two major centres of Cardiff and Newport to valleys across the region”
- “Acknowledging the interdependent relationship between Cardiff, one of Europe’s fast growing capital cities, and the wider Capital region is critical for the success of the WSP. Cardiff’s role as the key economic driver for the region, at the centre of a strong, regional economy which is internationally competitive, is essential. Cardiff will play a pivotal role as a key provider of higher level services, focusing on innovation and higher value-added knowledge sectors.”

Wales Spatial Plan

- “Cardiff can combine an international business offer with superb quality of life”
- “The City and Coast provides a superb environment in which to live. The pressure to provide more housing and employment land should be managed so as to fit in compatibility with conservation of the landscape, environment and community strength of the area. Substantial growth of housing in the coastal zone should also be compatible with the health of housing markets in the Heads of the Valleys and Connexions Corridor”

Community Strategy

- ‘What Matters’ 2010-2020
- “By 2020, Cardiff will be a world class European capital city with an exceptional quality of life and at the heart of a thriving city region”
- 7 Outcomes: Healthy, clean/attractive environment, safety, prosperous economy, achieving potential, great place to live/work/play and inclusive
**LDP Vision & Objectives**

- Approved by Full Council, March 2011
- Vision: As set out in ‘What Matters’
- Objectives: Set out under 4 headings:
  1. Respond to evidenced economic needs and provide the necessary infrastructure to deliver development
  2. Respond to evidenced social needs
  3. To deliver above needs in a co-ordinated way that respects Cardiff’s environment and responds to the challenges of climate change
  4. Create sustainable neighbourhoods that form part of a sustainable city

**Economic and infrastructure objectives**

- Respond to Cardiff's role as driver of city-region
- Maximise potential of city centre (regional transport hub)
- Continue regeneration of Cardiff Bay
- Promote clusters and key sectors
- Provide range and choice of sites
- Create the right conditions to attract investment
- Identify and deliver necessary infrastructure
- Establish Cardiff as a sustainable travel city
- Maintain mineral resource
- Deliver sustainable waste solutions

**Social Objectives**

- Provide new homes- evidenced need and demand
- Provide range & choice (families, affordability etc)
- Tackle inequalities & promote social inclusion
- Promote healthier lifestyles
- Make Cardiff a safer city
- Improve accessibility
- Maximise multi-functional role of parks & open spaces
- Support District & Local Centres
- Provide education & training facilities
- Develop cultural, leisure & sporting facilities
- Ensure that developments provide community facilities

**Environmental Objectives**

- Mitigate effects of and adapting to climate change
- Protect, manage and enhance environmental assets:
  - Parks & open spaces
  - River valleys- Ely, Taff, Nant Fawr, Rhymney
  - Countryside- especially areas of high landscape value
  - The city’s biodiversity resource
  - Natural resources in general
  - Built and historic assets
- Priority for identifying brownfield sites first
- Take full account of flood risk
- Create a clean & attractive environment

**Sustainable Neighbourhood objectives**

Creating sustainable neighbourhoods that:
- Minimise energy demand/ maximise renewable options
- Minimise car travel/ maximise sustainable transport
- Minimise waste to landfill/ maximise recycling
- Minimise water use/ maximise sustainable drainage
- Maximise provision of full range of social infrastructure
- Maximise benefits of new development to adjoining areas
- Maximise diversity of land uses
- Maximise multi-functional role of open spaces
- Maximise principles of good design
- Maximise community involvement in planning

**Environmental Context**

Distinctive landscape setting:
- Ridge to North rising to 1,000 feet
- Ridge to West- Leckwith escarpment
- 4 river corridors running through city
- Wentloog Levels to South East
- Severn Estuary to South (Flat Holm Island)
- Rich legacy of parks & open spaces
- Approx a third of area is countryside/ open space
- Summary depicted on map displayed at meeting
Environmental Context

Biodiversity interests:
- European Sites - Beech Woods & Estuary
- Network of designated sites displayed on wall

Historic interests:
- Victorian & Edwardian core to city
- Numerous protected areas displayed on wall

Flood Risk:
- SFCA undertaken - detailed work progressing
- Fluvial and tidal flood risk areas shown on wall

Social & Economic Context

Housing Need:
- 2,173 affordable dwellings p.a. needed 2008-13 LHMA (update being undertaken early 2012)
- Housing Waiting List (Combined) = 11,283 (Dec 2011)
- Number of households homeless and in temporary accommodation = 450 (Dec 2011)
- Need for extra 194 Gypsy & Traveller pitches 2008-16 + transit site 10 pitches (2008 survey study)
- Students = 32,000 (2010) 22% Cardiff home address, 57% other UK address & 21% Overseas home address
- Students make up 9.4% of Cardiff's population

Social & Economic Context

Housing Background:
- Population change average = 2.956% for last 10 years
- Population projected to increase from 330,500 by 57,600 2008-26 (+8,420 pop / +2,800 households p.a.) - Latest WO projections.
- Young age profile 0-24 years (2010) = 36.4% (Wales 30.7%)
- Housing Stock 2011 = 148,300. Rats 24.8%, Houses 75.2%
- Last 10 years construction = 16,900. Rats 65.8%, Houses 34.2% of which affordable 2,214 (13.2%), brownfield 13,500 (91.0%).
- Average House Prices Nov 11: Cardiff £145,657, (Wales £118,370)

City-region context: Level of growth

Projected population change to 2031

City-region context: Housing

Baseline scenarios and proposed future provision

City-region context: Housing

Demolition completions and proposed future provision
**Employment Growth in Cardiff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>GB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>150,571</td>
<td>1,039,078</td>
<td>24,354,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>168,254</td>
<td>1,080,312</td>
<td>26,214,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>176,086</td>
<td>1,087,479</td>
<td>25,956,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>191,224</td>
<td>1,082,342</td>
<td>26,887,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>192,520</td>
<td>1,107,988</td>
<td>26,386,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>190,948</td>
<td>1,183,048</td>
<td>26,677,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth 1998-2008</td>
<td>40,377 (+25.3%)</td>
<td>144,947 (+14.0%)</td>
<td>2,322,218 (+9.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment Sectors in Cardiff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>167,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; communications</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale, retail</td>
<td>40,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector, education, health</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Land – provides a range of choices. Substantial capacity for new office development within and south of city centre (CCD) and key main industry locating south and west of city. Nearly 60% of employment in city is service sector. Approx. 50% of jobs are located on employment land. A steady increase in jobs of 3% (2000-2008) not reflected by equivalent increase in employment land.

**Unemployment**

- Number of Unemployment Benefit Claimants in Cardiff
- Unemployment has risen since 2003/04. Between 2005 and 2008, the total number of unemployment claimants in Cardiff fell by 11.8%. By 2010 this figure had fallen to 6,200.

**Wider economic context**

- To fulfil its economic potential on behalf of Wales, Cardiff and the city region must improve access to employment and public sector opportunities, including access to London and Cardiff International Airport.
- Tourism – significant economic benefits. In 2010, 18.3 million visitors to Cardiff spent £922 million. A 21% increase in spending from 2009. (Source: STEAM 2010)
- Universities – 3 universities with a student population of 32,000, contributing over £140 million annually to Cardiff’s economy. Successful graduate retention provides a highly skilled workforce.
- Retail – Cardiff city centre is the main shopping centre for south west Wales, ranked in the top 10 retail centres in the UK. The recently completed £575m regeneration of St. David’s shopping centre has provided an additional 60,000 sqm of retail floor space and has attracted many new businesses to Wales and 75 million visitors in its first 2 years of opening.

**Spatial economic context**

- Key existing and future role of City Centre & Bay Core including CBD
- Map on display shows range of main existing employment areas within city protection of existing employment land issue
- Other map shows allocations within SE Wales
- Significant flood risk issues relating to low lying land near the Severn Estuary
- Range and choice considerations
- Scope for mixed use developments in any major new development area(s)

**City-region context: Employment past rates**

- Number of jobs created over past 10 years
- Employment growth in Cardiff and the city region must improve access to employment and public sector opportunities, including access to London and Cardiff International Airport.
- Tourism – significant economic benefits. In 2010, 18.3 million visitors to Cardiff spent £922 million. A 21% increase in spending from 2009. (Source: STEAM 2010)
- Universities – 3 universities with a student population of 32,000, contributing over £140 million annually to Cardiff’s economy. Successful graduate retention provides a highly skilled workforce.
- Retail – Cardiff city centre is the main shopping centre for south west Wales, ranked in the top 10 retail centres in the UK. The recently completed £575m regeneration of St. David’s shopping centre has provided an additional 60,000 sqm of retail floor space and has attracted many new businesses to Wales and 75 million visitors in its first 2 years of opening.
**City-region context: Employment**

- Employment Level Availability
- Diagram showing distribution of employment levels

**City-region context: Deprivation**

- Overall Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Map highlighting areas of deprivation

**Transportation Context**

- 2010: 74,200 commute into city each day
- Highway network operating at capacity
- Mean travel time: 22 minutes
- 1996-2010: 73% increase in travel to City Centre Rail Stations
- Demand management & sustainable transportation solutions required

**City-region context: Commuting**

- Infographic illustrating commuting patterns
- Map showing commuting routes and destinations

**Growth options context**

- Options must be realistic and sustainable
- WG 2008 projections are the starting point
- PPW also lists other factors:
  - WSP, Local Housing Strategy, Community Strategy
  - Local housing requirements (needs & demands)
  - Needs of the economy (local & national)
  - Capacity of an area (social/environmental)
  - Environmental Implications (including flood risk)
  - Infrastructure capacity
  - Climate Change factors
Growth options context
- Homes built/ being built 06-10: approx 8,000
- Landbank (Inc s.106): approx 12,000
- Landbank Adjustments: minus approx 3,000
- Estimated Windfalls/changes of use: approx 6,800
- Total number of homes from above= 23,800
- Past 5 year average homes pa (05-10): 1,728
- Past 8 year average homes pa (02-10): 1,803
- 1991-2001: 1,122 average homes pa
- Last year (09/10): 867
- Highest ever year (06/07): 2,368 (high proportion of flats)

Level of growth options
- 3 options presented in 2011 consultations:
  Option A: WG 2008 projections
  54,400 homes, 55,000 jobs
  Option B: Recalibrated projections
  45,400 homes, 40,000 jobs
  Option C: Past completion and migration rates
  36,500 homes, 26,000 jobs

Option A: 2008 based WG projections
- Due to sharp increase in international migration
- Based on net immigration of 2,400pa for the whole plan period
- 2,700 homes pa 2006-26
- 3,000 homes pa given low completions 06-10
- Plan would need to allocate c.30,000 homes in addition to those already built/ being built/ in landbank/ assumed windfalls- some 10,000 units in excess of units proposed in candidate site submissions
- 55,000 jobs

Option B: Recalibrated WG projections
- Retain ONS overall estimate of migration to the region but using more extensive local data to distribute this more accurately
- Based on net immigration of 1,500pa for plan period
- 2,300 homes pa 2006-26
- 2,400 homes pa given low completions 06-10
- Plan would need to allocate c.22,000 homes in addition to those already built/ being built/ in landbank/ assumed windfalls- slightly in excess of total number of units proposed in candidate site submissions
- 40,000 jobs

Option C: Past build & migration rates
- Based on past 5-6 year build and migration rates
- Based on net immigration of 600pa for plan period
- 1,800 homes pa 2006-26
- 1,900 homes pa given low completions 06-10
- Plan would need to allocate c.13,000 homes in addition to those already built/ being built/ in landbank/ assumed windfalls- some 7,000 units below those proposed in candidate site submissions
- 26,000 jobs
- Given evidenced need, a lower option is not realistic and contrary to guidance

Context for spatial options
- Candidate Sites help inform options
- 112 sites, c.18,000 greenfield, c.2,500 brownfield
- Sites being assessed against methodology: Vision, Objectives & 5 assessment criteria
- Plan does not have to be based exclusively on submitted candidate sites- provision can be met through smaller/larger/new sites
- Given finite brownfield supply & evidenced need, likely to be significant greenfield releases
- Cross boundary options not realistic to meet Cardiff’s needs given LDP tests of soundness
**Spatial options**

Options (shown on map) include:
- West: West Pentrebane/ Radyr c.4,250
- North West: North J33/south of Cregau: c.2,500
- North: North of motorway, Thornhill: c.1,200
- North East: West of Pontprennau c.5,000
  East of Pontprennau c.1,200
- East: Around St Mellons village: c.1,650
- East: Adjacent to St Mellons/Trowbridge: c.1,450
- Dispersed brownfield: c.2,500+ (work continues)
- Dispersed smaller greenfield: c.900

**Topics for discussion: 20/1**

(As agreed at meeting of 7/12)
- Level of population & household growth- Appropriate level for Cardiff, cross boundary implications & relationship with jobs, transport & infrastructure
- Economic development, employment land & retailing issues- Appropriate strategy for Cardiff, cross boundary implications & relationship with housing, transport & infrastructure

**Topics for discussion: 17/2**

(As agreed at meeting of 7/12)
- Transportation- Appropriate sustainable transportation solutions for Cardiff, cross boundary implications & relationship with jobs, housing and infrastructure
- Infrastructure & deliverability- What levels of growth can realistically be delivered? Are there any key strategic constraints?
- Environment- Green Belt/ Green Wedge? Strategic environmental/landscape areas
- Mop up of all topics
APPENDIX 5
Map of Cardiff showing constraints and candidate sites