



RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

10TH MAY 2018

CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO DRAFT PLANNING POLICY WALES EDITION 10

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION, PLANNING AND HOUSING IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENTERPRISE, DEVELOPMENT & HOUSING COUNCILLOR R BEVAN.

Author: Simon Gale, Service Director Planning: Tel 01443 281114

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to outline the content of the revised Planning Policy Wales (PPW) (Edition 10) issued for consultation by the Welsh Government; agree the Council's overarching response to the consultation; and to give authorisation to the Service Director Planning to submit a detailed response to Welsh Government on the technical questions attached to the consultations. The consultation is open until 18 May 2018.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:

- A) Note the contents of revised Planning Policy Wales (PPW) (Edition 10) issued for consultation by the Welsh Government (hold Ctrl and [click here for Draft PPW Edition 10](#))
- B) Agree the overarching consultation response (Appendix A) to be submitted to Welsh Government
- C) Give authorisation to the Service Director Planning to submit a further, detailed response to Welsh Government on the technical questions attached to the consultation. (Appendix B)

3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Planning Policy Wales is a national land use planning policy document which is used to inform the preparation of development plans and local planning policy such as Local Development Plans and is a material decision for officers and Members when considering planning applications. It is therefore important that

the Council makes appropriate representations on this document as it is a fundamental part of national planning policy guidance, informing the plan making process and planning decisions in Rhondda Cynon Taf.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Planning Policy Wales was first published in 2002, it has since been regularly revised with the most recent version being Edition 9 issued in 2016. All previous versions have been very similar in their format. This new version represents the 10th edition and has been rewritten to reflect the Well Being of Future Generations Act 2015. This 10th edition is now considerably restructured into policy themes which reflect the goals of the act.
- 4.2 The concept of Sustainable Placemaking is now core in the revised PPW. The document explains that *Placemaking capitalises on a local community's assets, inspiration, and potential, with the intention of creating development that promote people's health, happiness, and well-being. It is therefore central to the wider objectives of the WFG Act*
- 4.3 The revised PPW also updates planning policy in key areas, where necessary, to reflect all recent updated Welsh Government strategies and policies.
- 4.4 The consultation seeks views on the new structure of PPW, the placemaking concept and the new or revised policy requirements that have been proposed. The consultation has been set out formally in a series of 37 detailed technical questions to focus responses to specific changes.

5. DRAFT PLANNING POLICY WALES EDITION 10 DOCUMENT

- 5.1 The first 22 pages of the proposed PPW set out to explain the relationship between planning and the WFG Act, how PPW and the proposed National Development Framework set the national scene for local plans and local decision making.
- 5.2 The concept of 'Placemaking' is at the heart of the proposed PPW which states that *"Welsh Government believes that everyone engaged with or operating within the planning system in Wales must embrace the concept of placemaking..."* The document attempts to set out the key drivers for planning to deliver sustainable development for the well-being of our communities, including how the '5 ways of working' in the WFG Act should be applied.
- 5.3 Under the heading of placemaking, 5 key planning principles are put forward which the document suggests should be *"the starting point for all those involved in considering what they are trying to achieve."* The 5 key planning principles are:
1. *To facilitate the right development in the right place*
 2. *Making best use of Resources*
 3. *Facilitating Accessible and Healthy Environments*
 4. *Creating & Sustaining Communities*

5. Maximising environmental protection and limiting environmental impact

- 5.4 It should be noted that there is no reference to economic development, growth or prosperity in these key principles of planning
- 5.5 The next section sets out to explain what is a sustainable place and a number of diagrams and charts are used including one which outlines 41 characteristics of a sustainable place
- 5.6 All of the above explanations are then manifested in four strategic themes and the rest of the document and all of the policy areas (e.g. Housing, Transport, Energy, etc) are structured around these themes. The themes are:

Placemaking	Active and Social Places	Productive and Enterprising Places	Distinctive and Natural Places
Creating Sustainable Places	Housing	Economic Development	Landscape
Good Design	Retail and Commercial Centres	Tourism	Coastal Areas
Promoting Healthier Places	Community Facilities	The Rural Economy	Historic Environment
Making Spatial Choices	Recreational Spaces	Transportation Infrastructure	Green Infrastructure
Placemaking in Rural Areas	Transport	Telecommunications	Biodiversity
		Energy	Water, Air, Soundscape & Light
		Minerals	Flooding
		Waste	De-risking

6. ISSUES ARISING FROM THE DOCUMENT

- 6.1 Planning has long been a key tool in delivering on the concept of 'sustainable development' and it will continue to be a significant vehicle for the consideration and promotion of the goals of the WFG Act. It is therefore natural that the overarching planning policy document for Wales, PPW, should be updated to reflect the introduction of the WFG Act. The attempts that have been made in the document to explain the relationship between the well-being goals and ways of working and the plan making and decision making in the planning system are welcomed. In many ways the statements made, in isolation, are sensible, logical and generally acceptable.
- 6.2 However, the explanations of how planning and placemaking relate to the well-being agenda encompass nearly 30 pages of the start of the document, using narrative, diagrams and charts to show how the 7 well-being goals, 5 ways of working, 4 sustainable development principles, 3 key drivers result in 5 key planning principles that should be applied to 4 overarching themes that will eventually deliver the 5 key aspects of good design and 41 characteristics of sustainable places.

- 6.3 It is not clear from the document which of these elements are absolutes, which constitute policy, whether they are just guidance or tools to aid the design and planning of developments, or a checklist for the decision maker. Without such a hierarchy the document becomes much more difficult to implement or work with because ultimately, if a development has to tick every one of the boxes suggested, then nothing will ever be built or too many decisions will be vulnerable to challenge from third parties such as objectors or competitors.
- 6.4 There are also number of more specific issues that are worthy of note. First of all, it would be helpful if more if more prominence was given to benefits of Strategic Development Plans (SDPs) particularly the role they will have in supporting the City Region's aspirations. Following on from that, more support should be given towards changing how LDPs are prepared, particularly those that would sit under a SDP, to make them less onerous and cumbersome. There should be more narrative around the role of light touch LDPs and mechanisms to review LDPs in an expedient way.
- 6.5 At paragraph 2.61 of the document it is suggested that housing allocations of more than 1000 dwellings should only be included in joint LDPs, SDPs or the NDF as they are likely to have larger than local impacts. Whilst in theory there is some logic to this, in the absence of any adopted NDF or SDPs, there should still be a mechanism for major housing allocations to be promoted through LDPs or else there could be a considerable period of time when it will not be possible to give strategic opportunities statutory status and this will potentially inhibit significant developments that would otherwise have a key role in delivering the sustainable growth and placemaking advocated by the proposed document.
- 6.6 It is also considered that the document should be more clear on the role of the 5 year housing land supply process in the overall planning system. In recent years this matter has increased in profile with a significant number Council's with adopted LDPs not being able to demonstrate a land supply of 5 years or more. The focus on the issue has become so all-consuming that it appears to have distracted from the overall goals of the planning system around promoting growth, prosperity, well-being and protection for the natural environment.
- 6.7 It is accepted that one of the key roles of the planning system is to promote enough land to allow enough new dwellings to be delivered across a range of areas, tenures and types to enable all of our residents to have access to a safe and affordable home. However, it is increasingly apparent that the 5 year land supply is all that a LDP is being judged upon regardless of what else it is enabling for its community and this should not be the case. The prominence of the 5 year supply issue also means that more and more applications are coming forward across Wales for developments outside of LDP boundaries which, without careful consideration, will also be counter to the well-being objectives of this document.
- 6.8 Whilst a lot of the policy guidance in the document remains largely unchanged other than the more explicit links to the WFG Act, there are some new matters that are worthy of note.

- 6.9 These include a recommendation that greenbelts are matters that are best determined through the development of SDPs and the introduction of policy support for SME builders and for self and custom builders. This should be welcomed and it will have a particular benefit in promoting new housing delivery in the valley areas and assist the local economy through potentially giving new opportunities to local building companies. There is also the introduction of support for vehicle charging points in PPW, with the suggestion that there should be a requirement that 10% of non-residential car parking spaces in new developments to have charging points for Ultra Low Emission Vehicles.
- 6.10 In terms of the detailed questions asked in the consultation (see recommendation C at 2.1 of this report), these range from a series of questions seeking support for some of the principles outlined above to more technical questions around how viability of sites is tested, the design of streets, methodologies for transport and settlement hierarchies, etc and then questions related to the interlinkages of the various chapters.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) screening form has been prepared for the purpose of this report. It has been found that a full report is not required at this time. The EqIA form is attached at Appendix C.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1. No formal consultation necessary but the response drafted by the Service Director Planning has been done in consultation with the Council's Highways and Countryside departments.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None directly arising from the introduction of the document.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OR LEGISLATION CONSIDERED

- 10.1 Planning Policy Wales (PPW) is a national land use planning policy document used to inform the Local Development Plan (LDP) and is a material consideration when assessing planning applications.

11. LINKS TO THE COUNCIL'S CORPORATE PLAN / OTHER CORPORATE PRIORITIES / FUTURE GENERATIONS - SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- 11.1 The Draft PPW 10 has clear, multiple links to all Council's Corporate objectives. The use of the document will also help shape future development plans in Rhondda Cynon Taf. The overarching Wellbeing of Future Generations Act that now heads the structure and content of PPW will help form the Authorities' Well-Being Plans.

12. CONCLUSION

- 12.1 All nine of the previous editions of Planning Policy Wales were structured in much the same way and provided anyone with a need to engage with the planning system in Wales with a relatively straightforward, intuitive document to consult and with key matters such as housing, transport, environment, etc easily located, particularly for those practitioners who have used the various iterations of the document over the years.
- 12.2 Whilst the reasoning behind the restructuring of Planning Policy Wales to reflect the Wellbeing of Future Generation Act and other changes in legislation is understood, as is any move by Welsh Government to change the way people think about planning and its role in promoting well-being, there are concerns that the structure and content of the document are unclear and it is not readily apparent which elements of the document actually constitute the planning policy of Welsh Government rather than just being narrative. Therefore, the proposed 10th edition of PPW may no longer provide a clear policy document for use as national guidance for the planning system in Wales.

Other Information:-

Relevant Scrutiny Committee

Public Service Delivery, Communities & Prosperity

Contact Officer

Simon Gale, Service Director of Planning. 01443 281114

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

AS AMENDED BY

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

10TH MAY 2018

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION, PLANNING AND HOUSING IN
DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENTERPRISE
DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING COUNCILLOR ROBERT BEVAN**

Item: **CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO DRAFT PLANNING POLICY
WALES EDITION 10**

Background Papers

[Revised Planning Policy Wales – Edition 10](#)

Officer to Contact: Simon Gale, Service Director of Planning. 01443 281114

RESPONSE BY RHONDDA CYNON TAFF COUNCIL TO THE WELSH GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON THE REVISIONS TO PLANNING POLICY WALES (PPW EDITION 10)

To:

Neil Hemington

Prif Gynllunydd | Chief Planner

Y Gyfarwyddiaeth Gynllunio | Planning Directorate

Adran Cyfoeth Naturiol | Department for Natural Resources

Llywodraeth Cymru | Welsh Government

Dear Sir,

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO DRAFT PLANNING POLICY WALES EDITION 10

Thank you for the opportunity to consider and contribute to the development of the latest edition of Planning Policy Wales (PPW). Please accept this letter as the overarching response of the Authority which has been agreed by the Cabinet of the Council. The Authority will also submit a detailed technical response to the 37 questions attached to the consultation document.

RCT recognises that planning has long been a key tool in delivering on the concept of 'sustainable development' and it will continue to be a significant vehicle for the consideration and promotion of the goals of the WFG Act. It is therefore accepted that the overarching planning policy document for Wales, PPW, should be updated to reflect the introduction of the WFG Act. The attempts that have been made in the document to explain the relationship between the well-being goals and ways of working and the plan making and decision making in the planning system are welcomed. In many ways the statements made, in isolation, are sensible, logical and without argument.

However, the explanations of how planning and placemaking relate to the well-being agenda encompass nearly 30 pages of the start of the document, using narrative, diagrams and charts to show how the 7 well-being goals, 5 ways of working, 4 sustainable development principles, 3 key drivers result in 5 key planning principles that should be applied to 4 overarching themes that will eventually deliver the 5 key aspects of good design and 41 characteristics of sustainable places.

It is not clear from the document which of these elements are absolutes, which constitute policy, whether they are just guidance or tools to aid the design and planning of developments, or a checklist for the decision maker. Without such a hierarchy the document could become much more difficult to implement or work with because ultimately, if a development has to tick every one of the boxes suggested, then there is a risk too many developments will be resisted or too many decisions will be vulnerable to challenge from third parties such as objectors or competitors.

The authority also has some concern over the fact that there is no specific reference to economic development, growth or prosperity in the 5 key principles of planning at paragraph 2.7. Without such reference there is a risk that matters such as environmental protection will have too great a significance in the consideration of development proposals at the expense of the local, regional or national economy.

There are also number of more specific issues that the Authority wishes to comment on. First of all, it would be helpful if more if more prominence was given to the benefits of Strategic Development Plans (SDPs) particularly the role they will have in supporting the City Region's aspirations. Following on from that, more support should be given towards changing how LDPs are prepared, particularly those that would sit under a SDP, to make them less onerous and cumbersome. There should be more narrative around the role of light touch LDPs and mechanisms to review LDPs in an expedient way.

At paragraph 2.61 of the document it is suggested that housing allocations of more than 1000 dwellings should only be included in joint LDPs, SDPs or the NDF as they are likely to have larger than local impacts. Whilst in theory there is some logic to this, in the absence of any adopted NDF or SDPs, there should still be a mechanism for major housing allocations to be promoted through LDPs or else there could be a considerable period of time when it will not be possible to give strategic opportunities statutory status and this will potentially inhibit significant developments that would otherwise have a key role in delivering the sustainable growth and placemaking advocated by the proposed document.

The Authority also considers that the document should be clearer on the role of the 5 year housing land supply process in the overall planning system. In recent years this matter has increased in profile with a significant number Council's with adopted LDPs not being able to demonstrate a land supply of 5 years or more. The focus on the issue has become so all-consuming that it appears to have distracted from the overall goals of the planning system around promoting growth, prosperity, well-being and protection for the natural environment.

It is accepted that one of the key roles of the planning system is to promote enough land to allow enough new dwellings to be delivered across a range of areas, tenures and types to enable all of our residents to have access to a safe and affordable home. However, it is increasingly apparent that the 5 year land supply is all that a LDP is being judged upon regardless of what else it is

enabling for its community and the authority does not believe this should be the case. The prominence of the 5 year supply issue also means that more and more applications are coming forward across Wales for developments outside of LDP boundaries which, without careful consideration, will also be counter to the well-being objectives of the WFG Act and the aims of the draft PPW.

The Authority also notes the introduction of policy support for SME builders and for self and custom builders. This is welcomed and it will have a particular benefit in promoting new housing delivery in the valley areas and assist the local economy by giving new opportunities to local building companies.

It is respectfully requested that these matters are taken into account prior to the finalisation of the document along with the detailed technical response to the questions that accompanied the consultation which will be submitted through the online facility.

**Planning Policy Wales Edition 10 consultation
Comments of Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council**

1. Do you agree planning policy topics be clustered around themes which show their relationships with each other and the 7 well-being goals? If not, please explain why.

Firstly, it is understood why the proposed format is seeking to reflect the aims of the Wellbeing of Future Generations and the Environment Acts, alongside all other planning legislation and policy. However, it is not considered that planning policy works particularly well when clustered around such broad themes. The document is very different in its structure to the previous versions and it is difficult to find all the policy references in terms of topic. In its current format, it is likely to make the document difficult for use in impractical and illogical terms by planning practitioners and public alike when preparing, determining or commenting on planning applications.

With policies clustered around themes; the document is quite repetitive in terms of emphasising overall aims and objectives, which is not necessarily of benefit. It is also sometimes unclear what constitutes policy and what is merely 'introductory' text or diagrams within the chapters.

If the structure of the document is to be changed to this format, there needs to be a quick reference system under topic. Some of the topic areas, transportation for example, are divided between themes making it more likely to have to read through the entire document when looking for a specific topic or areas of policy may be missed. It is no longer a straightforward document to use and reference.

It may be beneficial instead to have an introductory section on the well-being goals that acts as an overarching strategy/policy with the remaining chapters set out by topic as per PPW 9. The layout of the existing PPW 9, with indexing at the conclusion of each chapter, is far more logical. The PPW 10 document could prove quite frustrating for use alike should WG choose to change the format from that established in PPW 9.

2. Do you agree the introduction provides an adequate overview of the planning system in Wales and appropriate context? If not, please explain why.

The introduction provides a good overview on the aims of the planning system and what it is trying to achieve. It provides a more helpful introduction than the previous versions, removing references for example, which makes it easier to read and will hopefully convey to the public what the aims of the planning system are.

Paragraph 1.1 makes reference to the NDF being at the top of the planning hierarchy and PPW to sit alongside. It is hoped that in the absence of an adopted NDF it aligns with PPW or is it the case that the WFG Act is actually at the top of the hierarchy now? If it is, then this should be made clear.

Paragraph 1.3 of the introduction references the need for Local Authorities to have regard to the well-being plans prepared for their area. This is supported as they will be more tailored to the plan area. However it is unclear from PPW where the well-being plans sit in relation to the planning system and what weight the local authority gives to

each piece of legislation. It is also prudent to note that the well-being plans have been in preparation by the joint boards for a number of years in the absence of this revised PPW document.

Para 1.10: the Law Commission is suggesting that the Welsh government should retain an up to date list of 'duties' relevant to planning and use PPW and TANs to explain how they are relevant. It would be useful to refer to the list of duties here.

Paragraph 1.16 makes reference to keeping plans regularly under review; this is understood as they provide certainty, however the process of doing so is very resource intensive and often a lengthy process particularly in relation to the limitations around the short form process of review. More guidance is needed in relation to this if the process of keeping plans up to date is to be efficient and effective.

Paragraph 1.18 -1.21 discusses the Sustainable Management of Natural Resources as introduced by the Environment Act. The premise of these is understood however it is difficult to see within the document how all of these different requirements work together. In particular, the Area Statement process has yet to be completed, so it is hard to comment on its relationship with the planning process. Hopefully it will be a co-production between NRW and the LAs (in the spirit of WFG Act) which will ensure it is relevant to planning and translates the SMNR locally. The Biodiversity Duty could be referenced here.

Paragraph 1.27 makes reference to the purpose of development plans being to provide certainty to the public and development industry, this is supported and is a very important part that the plan led system plays. However this certainty is put at risk due to the JHLA method of calculation as this can see a Local Authority having a less than 5 year land supply very soon after adopting a new plan. This may lead to pressure on Local Authorities for 'non-planned' (non-allocated) applications. This does not then provide certainty for anyone and is not helpful nor the point of the planning system.

In fact the interaction of the JHLA and viability assessment completely undermines the stated purpose of planning (development and use of land in the public interest, prioritising long term collective benefit as per para 1.7) by setting up short term (5year) housing land availability and **current** economic viability (for the developer) above all other considerations. The sustainable development principles and ways of working, and the Wales well-being goals cannot be achieved, particularly in areas of low land value and periods of economic austerity. The re-ordering of PPW around the WFG Act demonstrates this very clearly. Housing land supply and viability are very important planning considerations but they should not undermine the overall purpose of the planning system and the WFG Act.

Paragraph 1.32. The reference in this paragraph to LDPs having to be prepared quickly is questioned. Wording such as "quick" and "simple" concerning the production of LDPs is not considered a suitable choice in a national policy document. The process is presently so onerous in relation to the degree of evidence and work necessary to get a plan through to examination stage; it is felt that this is almost a contradiction in terms. The lexis employed highlights that there may be a lack of understanding or appreciation for the time it takes to undertake each element of the LDP process. Whilst it is understood that LDPs are intended to be much simpler documents with the new NDF and SDP structure there is still a statutory process to go

through to prepare them. Indeed, this PPW gives further levels of detailed considerations. The length of time taken to write these will depend on the nature and content of the SDP and how much local circumstances of the local authority area deviate from the generalised policies in the SDP. If there is a lot of locally specific content required in the LDP then this process maybe longer for some Local Authorities. It is also important to remember that resources are also a very large concern for many teams tasked with writing these plans and have a lot less resources than in previous plan cycles.

This paragraph also makes reference that in most cases joint LDPs will be appropriate; this may help in terms of combining LDP teams, but would on the other hand certainly make the process of producing a plan lengthier due to the governance structures etc. as experienced and documented already by those Local Authorities that have already undertaken this process.

The issue of Place Plans also requires a degree of clarification in terms of how they will operate in practice. Whilst a closer working relationship with local communities is welcomed; there could potentially be a resource issue, particularly if communities embark upon Place Plans at the same time, alongside the LPA working on both the SDP and LDPs. Despite Place Plans being the “community’s” plan; if they are to become SPG it is likely to require a significant degree of officer time and investment to make this happen and take it through a comprehensive consultation process. Following recent Place Plan events communities have been led to believe these documents can be ‘whatever they want them to be’ when in truth they need to conform to policies in the LDP.

Paragraph 1.35 is welcomed as it emphasises how important it is for all stakeholder to work together to deliver good outcome in the planning system.

3. Do you agree with the Planning Principles? If not, please explain why.

Placemaking is a crucial aspect of this document and sets the basis for the 5 ways of working. The placemaking chapter makes reference to the 7 wellbeing goals, along with the 5 ways of working as well as the sustainable development principles, this is confusing.

There are then 5 key planning principles, which are broadly agreed with and the content of them is understood. These are the sorts of principles that practitioners in all aspects of planning try to implement in practice. They are the kinds of issues that are considered during daily decision making and any sort of plan making process. However are these polices? Are planners expected to judge developments/applications against these principles? Another tier of criteria following the above well being and many sustainability goals are hard to keep up with.

The right development in the right place- in general this is supported and does happen at present; the way in which the best outcomes are achieved is through collaboration with other stakeholders. It is worth noting however that longer term infrastructure for example would need to be addressed through the SDP as a longer term document. If a Local Authority could not secure this through an SDP then there would be a risk that they could not include key infrastructure in their LDP due to the delivery of it being outside of the plan period. Negotiating the inclusion of such schemes into the SDP maybe difficult.

Making the best use of resources- This is generally supported

Facilitating accessible and healthy environments- this is supported but needs to be acknowledged by all stakeholders in the industry and viability taken into account accordingly.

Creating and sustaining communities- Although the principles of this principle are supported and understood it is difficult in practice to balance a need for housing though ever increasing demand, with appropriate densities and uses. Viability is also needs to be taken into account.

Maximising environmental protection and limiting environmental impact- the general principal of this is supported, however what this principle means in practice is difficult to understand.

4. Do you agree with the definition of what is a ‘Sustainable Place’? If not, please explain why.

“The planning system should create Sustainable Places which are attractive, sociable, positive, secure, welcoming, healthy and friendly. Development proposals should bring people together and make us want to live, work and play in areas with an unmistakable sense of place and well-being creating prosperity for all”.

Assuming that the text above is indeed the definition of a ‘sustainable place’ (it is not 100% clear); then there is no reason to disagree with it. The content is reflected in various areas of current academic theory, particularly that of Barton, Grant and Guise.

Are the terms within the spider diagram of ‘sustainable places’ merely there for information purposes or do they constitute policy that all applications will be measured against and required to satisfy in order to gain permission? If so how do we translate these 41 points into meaningful assessment criteria whether for allocating or in planning application terms? Are developments supposed to meet some or all of the points?

Should the diagram be larger so the text is of equivalent size to the main text, in particular if these 41 statements are to be used as assessment criteria. Are these 41 echoed in the Planning Outcomes table (only 22 blocks of text)? Keeping the same order and covering each would help.

Once again the terms within this diagram are very subjective and could be interpreted in vastly different ways. It would be useful to have clarification on some of the terminology employed, for example, “soundscapes”; “sufficient”; and “appropriate”.

Creating sustainable places as an output of the planning system is fully supported. The definition of sustainable places within the text box in this document whilst understood makes for very difficult, ambiguous and subjective policy wording. The term ‘friendly’ for example, how is this assessed when determining a planning application?

5. Do you agree with high-level planning outcomes highlighted by People and Places: The National Placemaking Outcomes? If not, please explain why.

Whilst it is understood that PPW aims to achieve sustainable development it is unclear how each of these requirements should be taken account of. For example how does

the definition of a sustainable place link to the national placemaking outcomes and the 5 ways of working and the 5 planning principles etc. this is very confusing for the industry and public alike.

The spider diagram and the planning outcome tables should co-relate. The principle of showing how the aspects of a sustainable place (spider) relate to the well-being goals (sustainable place outcomes table) is welcomed. The additional listing of 'sustainable benefits of development' (para 2.25) under the headings of economic, social, cultural and environmental considerations provides another layer of complexity. Some care should be taken to ensure that these 22 statements are encompassed by the sustainable place spider and the sustainable outcomes table. Some care is needed in the use of wording, using established planning terms or new wording from the WFG Act and its guidance documents.

Whilst many of the principles are supported and in general are good ideas, the practicality of these is questioned. In practical terms do all developments have to address all of these points? Do these constitute policy? If so some of the terms are ambiguous at best such a 'convenient access' and very subjective.

If development are expected to address all of these then viability will be affected.

The diagram under paragraph 2.20 aims to show how you use PPW to achieve sustainable places. This is very confusing and does not provide a clear reference. Suggest the diagram should be set out as text for clarity

It is however questioned how an LPA goes about measuring the following (under the *Assessing the Sustainable Benefits of Development* section):

How far the proposal supports the conditions that allow for the development and growth of the Welsh Language;

Any clarification would be appreciated.

6. Do you agree with the search sequence outlined for the formulation of development plan strategies? If not, please explain why.

The search sequence is supported and it is acknowledged that the re-use of brownfield land should be the starting point when locating development. However in many areas especially in the Heads of the Valleys area for example, whilst there may be many brownfield sites which could be allocated, these are often highly constrained and although not impossible to develop, could take longer to come forward, this is penalised in the AMR process. There is also an issue with delivering housing numbers and achieving the LDP housing requirement figure in terms of brownfield sites in that the development industry will take 'easier' greenfield sites before brownfield which can lead to these sites not delivering if allocated in the plan. There is also the issue of viability linked to the use in the brownfield sites due to the often constrained nature of them. Whilst protecting greenfield land the welsh Government demands for a 5 year land supply and achievement of housing numbers make greenfield sites in many instances a better choice for allocation.

7. Do you agree with our revised policy approach for the promotion of new settlements and urban extensions. If not, please explain why.

The new settlements policy approach is supported as settlements of this size can have a greater than local impact. There is a risk however with allocating these in the NDF or SDP that competing interests of the other local authorities could see some strategic schemes missed out. Would it be prudent to allow some flexibility for these to go into LDPs under these circumstances? Is there criteria for new settlements other than 1000 houses, you could split these sites up into sites of under 1000 houses which if located close enough together could have the same impact. That being said, as these plans are yet to come to fruition and, for example, a site of this size was identified as part of a LDP process; would it not be better to allocate 1,000+ new houses to help alleviate problems associated with the housing shortage or prevent such development as it is being promoted via a LDP?

8. Do you agree with our revised policy approach to the preference for the re-use of previously developed land? If not, please explain why

In general the re-use of previously developed land is supported. It can help regenerate areas and is often well located within settlements. However previously developed land can be constrained and therefore in many circumstances unviable to develop. Whilst it is understood that Local Authorities should address previously developed land particularly when it is an eyesore or dangerous, it is questioned if it should be allocated at all if it requires Local Authority intervention in order to make it viable and/or come forward for development. In terms of local authorities working to de-risk these types of sites, limited resources exist within authorities and therefore intervention to de-contaminate or remediate may not be possible. These sites as PPW tells us cannot go into plans unless they are viable and deliverable, and should not have to rely on public sector finance. Therefore should be an understanding that local authorities will be hesitant to allocate these sites as there are often problems in delivering development at an appropriate timescale for allocation within a plan. Local authorities should therefore not be penalised for not allocating or developing brownfield land first. Although providing there are largely unconstrained brownfield sites available, then they should absolutely be utilised over greenfield land.

In terms of working with landowners, this approach to securing sites is in general agreed with however this is not without its difficulty and agreement at deposit plan stage does not always carry through to actual development stage.

How do WG propose that LPAs 'de-risk' brownfield land, particularly when there are issues of contamination etc.? Who would pay for such things in times of austerity and budget cuts? If Council's have land that they can provide for less than best value, this might contribute in the short term however many Council's have sold off much of their acquisitions. The truth is that there are swathes of brownfield land all over Wales that are simply not viable to develop for a whole host of reasons. In other areas, development can only be located in certain places given existing development, topography, protected species, infrastructure and so on. There are larger factors at play in deciding what land should and indeed could be utilised for development.

Further consideration needs to be given to the national funding of sites to bring them forward for future development or future allocation.

9. Do you agree with our revised policy approach for the designation of Green Belts and Green Wedges? If not, please explain why.

This policy is supported, it is considered that green belts would be best allocated at an SDP level to ensure consistency or developed at least as part of a regional evidence base. It is also crucial with green belts and wedges that they serve a purpose and area designated as such.

10. Do you agree with the issues and inter-linkages highlighted in the introduction to the Active and Social Places chapter? What other issues and linkages could be identified to support this theme?

It is not obvious from the title what this theme addresses i.e. it is not obvious that housing (an important and frequently used topic) is included under this theme at first glance. The linkages between homes, commercial centres, retail and community facilities is understood and supported however, it is questioned why employment opportunities are not within this theme as this forms a major element of day to day life including many of the day to day journeys taken.

Whilst ensuring new and existing developments have access to community facilities is supported, in practice it is not always within the control of the LA to do this. Health care for example can be allocated on sites but ultimately it is for the NHS to finance this which unfortunately can be difficult due to lack of funding. Community facilities are often private sector led and therefore whilst land can be allocated to accommodate them and should be, it does not always mean these facilities will be delivered. When allocating new development next to existing commercial centres or community facilities objections are often raised due to the increased pressure put onto these facilities. Who ultimately should pay for these facilities?

The spider diagram which shows how this theme contributes to sustainable development and how an active and social place is defined is understood. However as previously stated how is this to be interpreted? Are all of these expected to be met? The terms are subjective and do not constitute good policy wording.

We also suggest adding; 'Capitalizing on existing natural and historic assets in development design to maximise social cohesion and a sense of place'.

11. Do you agree that it is important for viability to be assessed at the outset of the plan preparation process and for this to be supported by an enhanced role for housing trajectories? If not, please explain why.

There is general support for the viability to be assessed at the outset of the plan preparation process. The whole issue of viability however is a very difficult subject and requires some additional guidance from Welsh government. Viability is a fluid process, at the outset a viability appraisal can be undertaken and within a few months could have changed vastly due to market conditions. Given that many viability models are simply a 'best guess' and a small change in figures can result in a significant change in a scheme's viability; how can this be measured consistently? Having a candidate site submission accompanied by a positive viability assessment or indeed a developer letter at examination stage to certify a site deliverable by no means guarantees development. A site may still not come to fruition or indeed the developer may at

some future point ask for contributions to be waived for a number of reasons. Principal amongst these include the fact that the individual who submits the candidate site may not be the individuals/company who develops the site. Many consultants and developer's understand the precarious nature of the 'time value of money'; it will only take an economic dip or rise in build costs to render a scheme unviable. Given that a plan could take 4-5 years from commencement to adoption; this is enough time for global or national economic conditions to change substantially or indeed for the value of sterling to decrease. Therefore with the best will in the world, LPAs can only ensure viability and deliverability as far as practicably possible but it will by no means deliver development in every instance.

There is also the issue of validity, who prepares these assessments which are often costly and complicated? If a site promoter submits them they are realistically going to claim the site is viable to promote the allocation, the LA then has to have this independently assessed to ensure its correct. This can be a very costly and time consuming process. If the LA undertakes them instead of the promoter to ensure validity then impact of the resources of the LA would be vast. Refreshing these assessments which would have to be done over the plan process would further add to the resource implications. Sites should not be allocated in a plan if they rely on public sector finance to be viable.

There is again reference to LAs de-risking sites; this should not be done on privately owned sites as this is simply helping increase the profit of the private sector.

In terms of the housing trajectory as is the case now there is no certainty even with the most co-operative cohesive discussions with land owners and developers of sites being brought forward. It is the LA who loses out in this instance being unable to achieve its housing requirement figure in the plan and ultimately having to review its plan due to sites not being brought forward which is ultimately out of its control. Will there be any quick disincentives that a LA can give to prevent this happening?

Housing trajectories are inextricably linked to population. There has to be enough housing to meet the needs of the residents of an area. Population growth is based on a set of projections which have a habit of fluctuating due to the underlying factors that form part of the equation in their formulation. I do not see how this supports viability per se.

12. Do you agree that it is important for a flexibility allowance to be included as a policy requirement in order to facilitate the delivery of planned housing requirements? If not, please explain why.

Having flexibility in the plan is supported as issues can occur on sites unexpectedly especially those which suffer from unknown constraints. However, it depends how this 'requirement' would operate in principle. Plans cannot work without flexibility. All plans need to be flexible and aspirational to meet the housing needs of the Welsh population. Flexibility and aspiration are however currently penalised by the need to maintain a five year housing land supply. If the issue continues to be pushed it could lead to LPAs opting for low growth strategies in future plans to ensure that they do not fall victim to the residual method employed by TAN 1. This is an area that WG need to consider both pragmatically and carefully.

13. Do you agree that to deliver the new housing Wales needs it is necessary for local planning authorities to allocate a range of site sizes, including small sites, to provide opportunities for all types of house builder to contribute to the delivery of the proposed housing? If not, please explain why.

This is supported, although it is perhaps necessary to set a lower threshold of scale, otherwise allocation may become onerous e.g. 5 units. There is a need for LDPs to recognise that all sectors of the housing and development industry have an important role to play in the delivery of housing. Larger developers have a huge role to play in Wales in delivering new modern homes on a larger scale and contribute greatly to the economy. There is also a great need to encourage growth in the SME building sector which sadly has decreased since the recession as they play a very important role in delivering a different sector of housing, can help local business and contribute to the regeneration of communities. However whilst allocating the right size (smaller) sites is one important factor it is also important to remember that there are other factors such as finance and simplified planning policies which the SME industry requires help with in order to thrive.

If LPAs are working with their developers, HBF, Federation of Master Builders and so forth, then they'll know what each is likely to want in terms of sites (size, scale etc). They are also likely to know the areas in which these companies and individuals are likely to build. Most LPAs will provide a range of sites to offer opportunities for housing. Some LPAs are employing a number of innovative solutions to try and deliver housing numbers through a variety of methods. I think LPAs are best placed to lead on the allocation of land for housing within their Boroughs.

14. To ensure that small sites are allocated, should there be a requirement for a specific percentage (e.g. 20%) of sites to be small sites? If not, please explain why

No, there should not be a requirement. The planning system is becoming too rigid and onerous in a number of areas and doesn't need to be complicated further. LPAs know their areas and should know their developers needs and can allocate accordingly. For example a number of smaller, more local developers frequently state that they want smaller sites to lower risk. Therefore this needs to be reflected in the allocations with sites allocated accordingly. LPAs are best places to work with developers and cater for their needs, and needs are likely to differ between authorities.

15. Do you agree that the custom and self-build sector can play an important role in housing delivery, in particular when linked to the use of Local Development Orders and design codes? If not, please explain why.

This is supported. It is recognised that self and custom build can offer an alternative housing model especially in areas where the traditional approach to housing delivery has been unsuccessful. It provides for a greater choice for the market and can have many spin off benefits including increasing the local supply chain and supporting SME builders. The Welsh Government should also seek to support this industry by working with the financial sector which is often a major barrier for this type of development as they are seen as too much of a risk. The use of LDOs is an area that could be explored along with the 'plot shop' concept that is often used in other areas of Europe.

16. Do you agree that negotiating on an 'open book' basis would help to improve trust between the parties and facilitate the delivery of both market and affordable housing? If not, please explain why.

Ensuring a good working relationship is developed between the public and private sector is crucial for delivering the best planning outcome. Rhondda Cynon Taf have a proactive and generally informal Developer Forum which seeks to encourage open dialogue and more open ways of working between all relevant parties.

Viability is an area where this is particularly important. Whilst an open book policy is supported it is questioned if this could ever be fully achieved due to the commercial nature of the process. Transparency is an issue when negotiating on contributions as information submitted to the Local Authority is not always as objective as it could be. To some respects this is understood due to the commercially sensitive nature of the information; however it then leads to the Local Authority having to check each assessment to ensure it's a true and accurate reflection of viability. This is financially straining on the Council as often these expertise do not exist in house. This process needs to be considered by the Welsh Government as it's an area that is particularly problematic. Paragraph 3.36 also refers to community benefits, how are community benefits to be defined; it would be useful if WG would clarify that "community benefits" mean a Section 106 agreement or something else e.g. is it at the discretion of the local authority what community benefits are requested?

Regulation 122 of the CIL regs stipulates the limited use of planning obligations. Section 122.2 states that the obligation must be (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore whilst open negotiation is encouraged; LPAs should not be waiving contributions and approving applications if those concessions would make the development unacceptable in planning terms.

This section should be made clearer and definitions of these terms provided. The policy is a little ambiguous in its present form.

17. Do you agree with the changes to emphasise the need for the appropriate provision of community facilities when considering development proposal? If not, please explain why.

Define "community facilities" – Does this extend to buildings or are we simply talking about open space, community gardens and allotments? Where is the section for Rights of Way?

Allotments aside, how do we ensure provision of community facilities? Who pays? LPAs have budgetary constraints. S106 needs to comply with CIL regulation 122.2; could this meet all three parts of that regulation? Even if it did, would this render a development unviable? Who provides community facilities?

18. Do you agree that giving greater emphasis to the transport hierarchy will improve the location and design of new development? If not, please explain why.

The principles related to hierarchy of transport promoting active/sustainable travel reflect detailed considerations which only come into play if the development is appropriately located. The primary consideration should be to insure development is encouraged at sustainable locations and prohibited elsewhere. However, the topography of Wales, the existing infrastructure, provision of public transport services, local amenities and employment opportunities do not lend itself to such a hierarchy and therefore, a pragmatic and flexible approach should be adopted.

Furthermore, there remain pockets of severe deprivation in South East Wales whereby any new development will be welcomed. Local authorities may be reluctant to deter those developers, in those locations, who are unwilling to fully comply with the transport hierarchy.

19. Do you agree that the policy will enable the planning system to facilitate active travel and the provisions of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013? If not, please explain why.

Yes but only for within developments and could exacerbate safety of all highway users and free flow of traffic where the existing infrastructure does not facilitate objectives of the Act.

20. Do you agree that the policy will enable the creation of well-designed streets? If not, please explain why.

Yes and it will encourage improvements to the existing infrastructure to support the objectives of the Active Travel Act.

21. Do you agree with the requirement for non-residential development to have a minimum of 10% of car parking spaces with ULEV charging points? If not, please explain why.

Yes and it could be higher considering the anticipated reduction in manufacturing fossil fuel vehicles. There should also be a requirement for non-residential developments to provide at least 5 cycle storage lockers - to maximise the benefits of the new active travel infrastructure

The policy says that the planning system "should" ensure new development incorporates ULEV charging infrastructure. Does 'should' mean 'must' or will it be acceptable to leave some development go without incorporating it? This needs to be made clearer in policy; it's ambiguous at present.

Are housing developments expected to provide this infrastructure or indeed a percentage of it? Again, the requirements for charging points for Ultra Low Emission Vehicles should be made mandatory for all newly built residential dwellings.

22. Do you agree with the issues and inter-linkages highlighted in the introduction to the Productive and Enterprising Places chapter? What other issues and linkages could be identified to support this theme?

As with other chapters the number of linkages can provide more confusion than help; WG should not seek to add more. How is this illustration to be used? Does it constitute policy?

For detail, a minor wording suggestion in 4.19 8th bullet point end of first sentence '....including the use of **durable materials in developments.**'

23. Do you agree with the changes to Telecommunications section of the draft PPW? If not, what other changes could be made to clarify the situation? If not, please explain why.

The policy is quite generic on the whole. It is not considered that LPAs would struggle to provide a criterion based policy to help facilitate this kind of development. The suggestion of companies sharing infrastructure to reduce environmental impacts is welcomed.

24. Do you agree with the location of the transport infrastructure section in the Productive and Enterprising Places chapter? If not, please explain why

Yes. Although that being said, if the format is to remain as it is; it may make more sense to have all transported relation information together. A small suggested rewording of Para 4.67, middle sentence 'The delivery of land and policy supporting economic development should be **integrated with** social and environmental sustainability.' In the spirit of the wfg Act.

25. Do you agree with the new requirements for local renewable energy planning as set out in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why

Yes, although the energy assessment etc will entail considerable additional work .
Setting Renewable Energy targets (actually minimum provision targets) in the LDP will be new for us but it's a fair idea. Meanwhile, we have been monitoring implementation anyway

26. Do you agree with the use of the energy hierarchy for planning as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why

The five steps contained within the hierarchy seem a sensible approach going forward. However, the following points are raised;

Para 4.114 makes no mention of the importance of reducing energy demand through location of new development to minimise travel demand.

Para 4.117 first sentence is repeated unnecessarily in para 4.119.

Para 4.125: the 4th bullet point refers to "impacts"; the 5th one to "effects"; the 7th one to "sensitivity". For greater clarity, these could usefully be combined into one: "take into account the cumulative environmental (including landscape and biodiversity), social, cultural and economic impacts and opportunities from renewable and low carbon energy development and associated infrastructure (e.g. grid connections);"

Para 4.126 “Renewable and low carbon energy projects are in principle appropriate in all parts of Wales” is too sweeping and simplistic a statement and conflicts with TAN 8 and para 4.139 which define some areas of Wales where some energy projects “will not generally be appropriate”.

Para.s 4.128 to 4.131 support “local energy generation”, without being sufficiently clear that the support is really only for local renewable and low carbon energy generation.

Para 4.143. The 3rd bullet point refers to the “construction and operation” phases of a renewable or low carbon energy project. The opening sentence should relate all 5 of the bullet points to the “construction, operation, decommissioning, remediation and aftercare” phases of an energy project.

27. Do you agree with the approach taken to coal and onshore oil and gas as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why. Please consider each source separately.

Yes, but a significant proportion of the oil and gas text is factual. The section could be simplified by concentrating more on the policy content. It is agreed that the use of fossil fuels should be phased out when the technology is in place to do so.

Para 4.161 deals with “opencast, deep-mine development or colliery spoil disposal”, so does not appear to address coal recovery from old colliery spoil tips. Old colliery spoil tips have been found to be of very high biodiversity value, in particular in relation to pollinating insects, therefore the inclusion of coal recovery in para 4.161/2 would be appropriate for both decarbonisation and biodiversity reasons.

28. Do you agree with the approach taken to promoting the circular economy and its relationship to traditional waste and minerals planning as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why.

Yes, however, the following points are raised;

Para 4.166: “designing out waste using materials which are or can be remanufactured ...” – the logical object is to be “designing in waste-using materials”, not designing them out. Alternatively, perhaps a comma is needed to convey a different meaning, as follows: “designing out waste, using materials which are or can be remanufactured ...”

Para 4.169: “layering” is not a term that is readily understood (also 4.174); we suggest a further bullet point “promoting re-use of buildings whenever possible”.

Para 4.175: the use of colliery shale (colliery spoil in para 4.212) as a substitute for primary aggregates will need to consider biodiversity and ecosystem resilience impact on a case by case basis.

29. Do you agree with the issues and inter-linkages highlighted in the introduction to the Distinctive and Natural Places chapter? What other issues and linkages could be identified to support this theme?

Again, as with other chapters the number of linkages provides more confusion than help; WG should not seek to add more. How is this illustration to be used? Does it constitute policy?

In para 5.6 a prosperous Wales should include reference to the rural industries such as agriculture and forestry that depend on the natural environment. In para 5.7 resilience should include reference to soils and flood mitigation. Para 5.8 should include reference to tranquillity. Suggested rewording for 5.9 second sentence: **'Regeneration should promote beneficial uses to allow communities and the natural environment to thrive.'**

Typo in para 5.12 'A Globally **Responsible** Wales....

In para 5.19 2nd bullet suggested minor addition '.....whilst the network of sites (**both national and local**) should be recognised

Amendment to 3rd bullet '.....are taken by **considering functional floodplains**, diffuse pollution... '

4th bullet '....secure **areas of tranquillity**, sustainable drainage.....'

30. Do you agree with the approach taken to landscape, biodiversity and green infrastructure? If not, please explain why.

Para 5.43 suggest an amendment to the next to last sentence. '.....to protect or enhance biodiversity and these should be **integrated** with the economic needs of business and local communities.' In the spirit of the wfg Act.

The need for sound ecological advice should be noted in para 5.46 (for both the LA and the developer)

Also in 5.46. because management is so important for successful biodiversity outcomes, under the bullet points 'extent' add to second sentence

'.....seek the creation, restoration and **appropriate management** of green networks..... '

and under bullet point 'connectivity' add at end of first sentence

'and encouraging habitat creation, restoration and **appropriate management**'.

Para 5.58 suggested addition to section 3 second sentence. 'planning authorities should take care to ensure that any conditions are **necessary to implement this policy**, relevant to planning.....'

In the first sentence under 'conditions, obligations or advisory notes' the text refers to these being used to secure beneficial biodiversity outcomes. Whereas they are mostly used to ensure necessary mitigation, so suggest change end of sentence to read '....a planning permission, to secure **necessary mitigation and** beneficial biodiversity outcomes.'

Then in the next sentence the text should be amended to refers to

'Planning authorities should take care to ensure that any conditions are **necessary to implement this policy**, relevant to planning.....'

We support the new wording re trees woodlands and hedges

The focus on Green Infrastructure is welcome. Is a TAN on Green Infrastructure proposed? A Green Infrastructure Assessment is mentioned in paras 5.36, 5.38, 5.50, 5.54, 5.57, 5.58, 5.64, 5.92 5.95, 5.113, 5.145, 5.155, 5.169 in addition to the main paragraphs. This has significant resource implications for Local Authorities.

There is concern that, in particular for residential development, viability considerations are currently limiting the scope for green infrastructure (including open space, play space, protection of trees, hedges and other landscape or habitat features, sustainable drainage and active travel corridors). This is unlikely to change whilst the planning system gives priority to housing land supply and viability assessment.

Para 5.70 It is to be hoped that the Area Statements will draw on the data held by Local Authorities as well as NRW in their co-production.

The key species and habitat monitoring proposed in para 5.73 is not possible with current Local Authority resources and it is far from clear or proven that such monitoring would provide the meaningful feedback mechanism that it seeks to provide.

A more direct means to monitor planning success would be the review and monitoring of the success and delivery of habitat and species mitigation requirements secured through conditions and obligations. This would help to ensure that long-term mitigation measures and enhancement measures are actually being delivered, would help to ensure developers are properly engaged with mitigation delivery and would provide a direct feed forward into the development of best practice and future mitigation planning. The results of such monitoring will be directly tied to the realities of planning delivery.

31. Do you agree with the approach taken to distinctive coastal? If not, please explain why.

N/A

32. Do you agree with the approach taken to air quality and soundscape? If not, please explain why.

'Soundscape' isn't an explicit term. The approach to air quality appears sound.

Para 5.125 should also indicate that noise, air and light pollution also affect biodiversity and the resilience of ecosystems.

Para 5.136: concern that this paragraph could direct polluting developments to areas of high nature conservation value because they have low potential for public exposure. Suggest adding a further bullet point to para 5.137

- Effect on biodiversity and ecosystem resilience

Para 5.140. Consideration also needs to be given to reducing the pollution generated by sensitive developments, in particular traffic, and the inclusion of active travel, traffic management , travel plans etc. in their design.

33. Do you agree with the approach taken to water services as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why.

In general yes. Minor amendment to para' 5.159 end of sentence
'.....water resources, including the ecology of **wetlands**, rivers and groundwater.

Para 5.167 and 169. This is a 'must' not a 'should' (as per para 2.23) at the very least it should detail the standards for sustainable drainage and the parallel process that has been established. It is not clear how GI assessments will contribute, maybe in identifying areas where the water table is too high for 'natural' suds (para 5.177)?

PPW offers a chance to integrate planning and the new drainage requirements and the wording here is inadequate.

34. Do you agree with the approach taken to addressing environmental risks and a de-risking approach? If not, please explain why.

Re para 5.189: It is important to note that not all formerly developed sites should now be considered as 'derelict'. Many of the former colliery spoil tips in the south Wales valleys are now seen as community assets not derelict land. The biodiversity value of these sites, particularly for pollinating insects, is now widely recognised. Their cultural, historic, geological and landscape attributes and their use as local informal recreation sites, often open access land close to settlements, is also highly valued.

Research on colliery spoil sites in Rhondda Cynon Taf and elsewhere, suggests that they make an important contribution to ecological resilience, perhaps providing a refuge for species lost from more 'traditional' habitats.

Para 5.192 suggested amendment to end of 3rd bullet point
'.....might have on **biodiversity**, the natural and historic environment;'

35. Do you agree that other than those policy statements referred to in Questions 1 to 33 above, the remainder accurately reflect the existing policy? If not, please explain why.

Yes

36. Are there any existing policy statements in PPW Edition 9 which you think have not been included in the draft of PPW Edition 10 and you consider should be retained? If so, please specify.

4.5.11 Ecological footprint include in section 1 or 2 (more than just carbon)

11.1.13 PROW include in section 3

LBAP or Local Nature Partnerships include in section 5

5.4.5 LNR include in section 5

Is Planning Enforcement covered?

An index of which paragraphs from PPW9 have been transferred, amended or omitted would be useful

Other:

Page 37 – Placemaking in Rural Areas: How does one conserve the “physiography” of the Countryside? Is this the correct choice of word? (Physiography - science of physical geography - understanding the forces that produce and change rocks, weather, oceans and global flora and fauna)

Integrated Planning and Transport Strategies

Section 3.119 - Planning authorities must set....., the following additional bullet points would be helpful:-

- Measures to encourage the use of Ultra Low Emission Vehicles.
- Control of access to the strategic highway network and combining individual accesses to improve highway safety, capacity, air pollution and shorter journey time.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Please ensure that you refer to the 'Equality Impact Assessment Guidance' when completing this form. If you would like further assistance please contact the Equality & Diversity Team.

Details

Name of initiative to be assessed: Planning Policy Wales Edition 10 Consultation

Name of responsible officer: Simon Gale

Group/Directorate: Regeneration, Planning and Housing

Service Area: Planning

Date: 10/04/2018

a) What are you assessing for impact?

Service/ Function	Policy/ Procedure	Project	Strategy	Plan	Proposal	Information/ Position statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Please name and describe below:

Welsh Government has issued a draft replacement Planning Policy Wales for public consultation. This is a proposed replacement to the existing Planning Policy Wales and will form the 10th amended edition of the document. Planning Policy Wales (PPW) sets out the land use planning policies of the Welsh Government and provides the context for land use planning in Wales.

**c) Is the delivery of this initiative affected by legislation or other drivers such as codes of practice?
If so, please identify what and how**

Planning Policy Wales translates wider Welsh Government objectives and strategies into the planning system, and is directly affected by elements of a suite of legislation, including in particular; The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015; The Environment (Wales) Act 2016; The Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013; The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) and The Planning (Wales) Act 2015

d) Does the initiative directly affect service users, employees or the wider community?

Yes Continue assessment
 No No need to continue screening or carry out an EqIA

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Screening/Relevance Test: Is an equality impact assessment required?

Screening is used to decide whether the initiative you are responsible for has a high or medium impact on any of the protected groups and will require a full EqIA.

Please provide details of the possible impact your proposal may have on the following groups, this may not necessarily be negative, but may impact on a group with a particular characteristic in a specific way.

You should also identify whether this constitutes a high, medium or low impact.

Please refer to Equality Impact Assessment Guidelines for further information.

Protected Characteristic	Impact
Age	Yes - Positive improvement of standards
Disability	Yes - Positive improvement of standards
Gender Reassignment	No
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnancy and Maternity	No
Race	No
Religion or Belief	No
Sex	No
Sexual Orientation	No
Other Characteristics	
Welsh Language	Yes - Positive improvement of standards
Carers	No
Armed Forces Community	No

If after completing the EqIA screening/relevance test, you determine that this service/function/policy/project is not relevant for an EqIA you must provide adequate explanation below. (Please use additional pages if necessary).

It is not considered that the consultation document and in particular the Council's response to it requires further EqIA from Rhondda Cynon Taf. Due consideration of these matters during the preparation of the draft replacement PPW would have been undertaken by Welsh Government themselves.

Are you happy that you have sufficient evidence to justify your decision?

Yes

No

Signed: Owen Jones

Position: Team Leader

Date: 10 April 2018

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

N.B. If the initial screening process has identified actual or potential high or medium negative impact on a particular group or groups then you MUST carry out a full EqIA.

Approved by Head of Service or Director

Signed: Simon Gale

Position: Service Director Planning Date: 11.4.18

Full Equality Impact Assessment

You should use the information gathered at the screening stage to assist you in identifying possible negative/adverse impact and clearly identify which groups are affected.

In terms of any disproportionate/negative/adverse impact that the proposal may have on a protected group, what steps (if any) could be taken to reduce that impact for each group identified. Attach a separate action plan if necessary.

If ways of reducing the impact have been identified but are not possible, please explain why they are not possible.

Evidence Sources

(i) Give details of any data or research that has led to your reasoning above, in particular, the sources used for establishing the demographics of service users.

(ii) Give details of how you have engaged with service users on the proposals and steps taken to avoid any disproportionate impact on a protected group and how you have used any feedback to influence your decision.

Are you satisfied that the engagement process complies with the requirements of the Statutory Equality Duties?

Yes

No

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Decision Log - detail how Elected Members and Senior Managers have been involved in the decision process (give dates of key meetings and decisions made).

--

Review

Date of Next Review:	
If review is not required, explain why:	

Completed by:	
Signature:	
Job Title:	
Date:	

This assessment must be approved by an appropriate Head of Service or Director

Approved by:	
Signature:	
Job Title:	
Approval date:	

Please return a copy to:

Equality & Diversity Team
The Pavilions
Cambrian Park
Clydach Vale
CF40 2XX

Email: equality@rctcbc.gov.uk