

Cyngor Sir CEREDIGION



CEREDIGION County Council

## UDP – Public Local Inquiry Proof of Evidence

Proof Number: LA/No.477

Settlement: Gwbert  
(Inset No. 049)



## I. Contents

I.	Contents	3
II.	Introduction	4
III.	Policy Context	5
IV.	Settlement Overview	6
V.	Summary of Representations	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	Deposit Objections and LPA Responses	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	Proposed Changes Objections and LPA Responses	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
VI.	Conclusion	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	Appendix 1	15
	List of Objections by Objectors	15
	Appendix 2	17
	Representations received to the UDP Deposit Version	17
	Appendix 3	21
	Representations received to the UDP Proposed Changes Document	21
	None received	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	Appendix 4	23
	Extract from Topic Paper 2 : Settlement Strategy and Site Selection, Section 5 (CD 255)	23
	Appendix 5	27
	Appendix 6	29
	Minutes of Area Settlement Panel 1 <sup>st</sup> December 2003 (Extract) and Full Council 22 <sup>nd</sup> December 2003	29
	Appendix 7	37
	List of Maps relating to...	37



## II. Introduction

This is the proof of evidence of Julie Thomas, representing Ceredigion County Council, whose details and qualifications are displayed in the Programme Office and at all Inquiry venues.

This introduction explains how to use this document (proof). The proof covers all the objections to **Gwbert (Inset No. 049)**. The LPA has already addressed the issues raised regarding the Deposit Version in the Area Settlement Panel Report which was reported to Members on the 1<sup>st</sup> December 2003. A copy of the LPA responses in this report along with the minute is attached in Appendix 5 and 6. These issues will not be addressed again within this Proof unless new information has come to hand since the Area Panel report was written, or unless the LPA wish to suggest an alternative solution to that agreed at the Area panel, or where additional response is necessary to address a Proof submitted by the Objector. Where additional response is needed this has been set out in Section V of the main report. Section V also contains the LPA's response to any Objections received at the Proposed Changes stage. The conclusion to Section V sets out any proposed and further proposed changes in respect of the Inset Map(s) and Settlement Statement for the settlement, which the LPA asks the Inspector to consider for adoption.

Appendix 1 lists by name all those who submitted representations regarding this settlement and identifies the relevant paragraph(s) within the main report or the Area Settlement Panel report where the LPA have addressed each Objection. Also, Appendix 1 lists any Proposed Change that may resolve the Objections identified. A detailed summary of your objection is contained in Appendix 2 for objections to the Deposit Version and Appendix 3 for objections to the Proposed Changes documents (February 2004 and September 2004). An extract from Topic Paper 2: Settlement Strategy and Site Selection, Section 5 (Core Document CD 255) is included at Appendix 4.

Appendix 7 lists any maps which help illustrate sites referred to in this proof. These maps can be viewed electronically on the Inquiry website, or can be viewed in the Inquiry library at the Council Offices in Aberaeron or alternatively can be obtained upon request from the Policy and Forward Planning Team (contact Catrin Cond on 01545 572123). Copies of the map(s) will be available on a projection screen during the Inquiry session for this settlement.

### III. Policy Context

- a The distribution of additional opportunities for further growth and development (including employment, housing, tourism etc) throughout the County is generally based on the principle of providing appropriate opportunity for development in order to support and sustain existing communities whilst also ensuring that the scale of development proposed reflects the ability of the settlement and community to accommodate further growth. However, some settlements, particularly the main towns and larger settlements have been identified, in line with national guidance (PPW, March 2002, Para 2.5.3) as suitable to accommodate more growth than is needed by their own communities. These settlements have been identified as having a wider strategic role to play in terms of meeting the general employment, community and housing requirements of the wider area. Therefore in line with guidance, the main towns and larger settlements will provide for a large proportion of future growth within the County (see Topic Paper 2: Settlement Strategy and Site Selection, Section 4 for further detail regarding housing).
- b In terms of future housing requirements, appropriate distribution of provision within Ceredigion (the Settlement Strategy) was determined by considering at the local level (settlement/community) what level of growth would be appropriate (bottom-up) whilst taking into account, national guidance that exists regarding the location of new development (top-down). The LPA approach to creating the Settlement Strategy for the County is set out in Topic Paper 2 (Section 4). This Strategy establishes housing policy and a spatial pattern of how housing provision will be distributed throughout the County.
- c Within the Strategy, settlements have been classified into either main towns, larger settlements or smaller settlements (with settlement boundaries) based on the role and characteristics of that settlement. The position of each settlement within this hierarchy, and the level of growth considered suitable for each settlement has been determined through a bottom up approach (see Section 4 of Topic Paper 2 for further detail).

#### IV. Settlement Overview

- a. Gwbert lies on elevated ground at the mouth of the Teifi estuary, some 4 km (2.5 miles) north-west of Cardigan. Situated close to the Pen yr Erygd Site of Special Scientific Interest in the Teifi estuary to the south and to Cardigan Island Nature Reserve to the north, Gwbert is the southerly termination point of the Ceredigion Heritage Coast and lies within the Special Landscape Area of the Ceredigion Coast and the Coastal Enhancement Area. It is a busy seasonal tourist destination, attracting visitors to the Cardigan Island Wildlife Centre and being popular for its coastal walks and scenery, with important views across the Teifi estuary. It has a golf club and a squash court and a nine hole golf course attached to the Cliff Hotel situated on the headland. This is one of two hotels in the settlement. There is a caravan site and yacht club at Patch, to the south west of the settlement in the Teifi estuary, where boating and water sports are very popular.
  
- b. Gwbert comprises over 70 residential properties of largely mid to late 20<sup>th</sup> Century origin lacking any consistency in style, but being predominantly, though not exclusively, variations on chalet bungalow style. Picture windows and conservatories feature strongly, taking advantage of splendid views over the Teifi Estuary and associated coastline. To the south of the settlement is a cluster of 1920s dwellings which forms an isolated development within what the LPA consider 'open countryside' on elevated land adjacent to the B4548 and therefore inappropriate for further development. (See paragraph k below for a further explanation). Gwbert has a current estimated population of 137. A total of 7 dwelling units were completed within Gwbert over the last 15 years (1986-2001) and at the beginning of the UDP plan period there were 9 outstanding residential planning consents.

- c. Because of its outstanding scenic qualities, it is a settlement with development pressure. However, though the settlement has a great deal to offer as a tourist destination it has few services and facilities serving the everyday needs of the resident population, for which it relies almost entirely on Cardigan (to which there is a limited bus service) as well as for primary as well as secondary schools. Tourism offers some, mainly seasonal employment, but the settlement is for the most part dependent on job opportunities at Cardigan. Gwbert's infrastructure is a constraint to development.
- d. In the next 15 years the housing needs within this community will predominantly result from changes in the way people choose to live. Overall people will live in smaller groups, and for that reason alone will need additional housing. This is because household size will generally become smaller due to changes in lifestyle (more people living alone) and people living longer. These needs will arise out of the local community (encompassing both those living within the existing settlement and the immediate surroundings).
- e. Given its constraints, its distance from Cardigan away from the main transport corridor and its lack of everyday facilities, it is a settlement covered by policy H1.3 of the UDP. It is felt that the right provision for Gwbert during the period from 2001 to 2016 is up to 10 houses. This level of provision is slightly higher than previous growth but takes account of the number of outstanding consents. (The requirement for 10 units is just one more than the number of outstanding planning consents at 2001). There have been 4 residential completions between July 2001 and July 2004. Improvements to the sewerage infrastructure are expected to help address concerns over potential negative impacts of development.
- f. The fact of existing consents pre-empts the ability of the LPA to tailor development closely to the needs of the community as it might where new applications come

forward for consideration under the more robust planning policies of the UDP. The provision for affordable need for the settlement is likely therefore to have to be treated as exceptional. Policy H2.2 of the UDP provides for the exceptional consideration of rural affordable housing need.

- g. Having defined the role of Gwbert within the hierarchy and hence the appropriate level of development (10 units) it was necessary to identify the land requirement to provide for that residential development. Although sites have not been specifically allocated for residential development, the LPA consider that the same criteria were valid in site selection whether allocating or not. Topic Paper 2 (Section 5) sets out in detail the broad approach taken in identifying sites to facilitate future provision within settlements (see Appendix 4 for an extract from Topic Paper 2, Section 5). The search sequence for additional sites is based on considering the potential for the re-use of existing buildings or previously used land as the first option, followed by the potential for growth to be met by spaces or undeveloped gaps within existing frontages, and then new sites at the edge of the settlement. The land that has been included within the defined settlement boundary is based on the consideration of potential for re-use, infill and additional sites in relation to guidance that exists on site selection.
- h. Given that at the beginning of the UDP plan period there were 9 outstanding residential consents and no 'brownfield' opportunities for development (refurbishment/modernisation of existing dwellings excepted, since such development would not add to the housing stock) the LPA considered that the addition of a further relatively small piece of land would add to the possible choice available should existing consents lapse or should extant sites prove to be unlikely to come forward in the plan period.

- i. Outstanding consents were concentrated on Tywyn Farm land and in the vicinity of the Gwbert Hotel. Greenfield infill sites at the south eastern corner of the elevated housing estate east of the Gwbert Hotel with some planning history and previously included within the Ceredigion Local Plan boundary were also considered suitable for development.
- j. Finally, land presently forming part of the nine-hole golf course of the Cliff Hotel was newly included within the settlement boundary. Choosing additional potential development land in Gwbert is problematic. Firstly, the settlement is entirely surrounded by designations to protect the quality of the natural environment. Expansion of the settlement boundary in any direction is therefore to intrude into Special Landscape Area. That being the case, sequential site search was the basis for the choice of Site 42/A, which lies in a gap adjacent to the busiest part of the core settlement in the vicinity of the Gwbert Hotel. The impact of development at this site from viewpoints out to sea or from the headland would be less intrusive than development at higher elevations and in view of the existing development on the opposite side of the road. Should development come forward at the site, there would be an opportunity to achieve some form of pedestrian footway to the frontage to help alleviate the vehicular/pedestrian conflict occurring on this stretch of road. Single storey development at low density, along with the sensitive treatment of elevations would be capable of mitigating impacts both on the visual amenity of existing properties and from the Special Landscape Area. Impact of development at this location, because it would add to the existing bulk of the built form, is considered to be less intrusive than the inclusion of land along Coronation Drive southwards from the settlement, for example (identified as land at 49/C).
- k. In respect of development on Coronation Drive, the properties in the group starting at Seabank and ending at Charlesbey, form a distinctive enclave. The cluster is an identifiable and characterful element of the built form, physically recognisable on the

ground as part of Gwbert. In planning terms, however, the cluster is not considered suitable to be encompassed within a development boundary, (even a nucleated one as for example at Tresaith) since that would imply (as it does at Tresaith) that the LPA consider it to be potentially capable of supporting further development proposals within that 'development' boundary. The LPA does not consider it so, not least because Gwbert generally is identified for very limited growth; which is why the cluster is referred to as being 'in open countryside'.

- l. The LPA does not specify an average density for residential development because the acceptable density will vary between settlements and also between sites within the settlement. The additional land at 42/A would be expected to be developed at very low density, though without an expectation of the development of very large properties, taking as an example instead the relatively modest neighbouring property known as Four Winds.
- m. The settlement boundary for Gwbert has therefore been defined with reference to the existing built form and to include a sufficient amount of land to meet housing needs for the next 15 years. On this basis, apart from in exceptional circumstances, development outside of the settlement boundary will not be permitted. In Gwbert policy H2.2 may have a key role to play in the delivery of affordable housing, which could allow for minor exceptional development outside of the defined settlement boundary.

## V. Summary of Representations

There were 11 representations to the Deposit UDP for Gwbert: one of support and 10 of objection.

Support was given to the proposed settlement boundary. Objections were largely site specific, with requests for no further expansion of the settlement in view of sewerage constraints, road safety concerns, loss of visual amenity and recreational opportunity and adverse impact on the community: but also conversely for the redrawing of the boundary, both to recognise the existing built form and to include further land.

There were a further 3 objections to the Proposed Changes document at PC 297, the reference in the Infrastructure section of the Settlement Statement to public sewerage serving part of the settlement; and a further note in respect of the accuracy of the settlement statement.

The sites objected to in the Deposit Version and Proposed Changes document are listed below:

### **Sites included within the settlement boundary**

42/A Land part of the Cliff Hotel 9 hole golf course.

6 Objections (including petition) and 1 Support at Deposit

No representations received at Proposed Changes

**Omission sites:**

42/C Land on Coronation Drive, between 'Engar' and 'Seabank' and between 'Seabank and Charlsbey'

1 Objection and no Support at Deposit

No representations received at Proposed Changes

**Deposit Objections and LPA Responses**

The following additional comments are made to further clarify the LPA's response(s) regarding specific issues and/or to update existing responses:

**1. Point 1****1.a. The information contained within the Settlement Statement regarding the current state of the sewerage infrastructure can be further updated.**

- 1.a.1. Upgrading of the sewerage infrastructure at Gwbert is being undertaken presently. DCWW required the addition of the phrase relating to the existence of public sewers to part of the settlement and as such the LPA is obliged to respond to their request for a change to the wording of the Settlement Statement. The LPA proposes a further change to the Settlement Statement at PC 297.001 (see below).

**2. Point 2****2.a. Site 42/A should be deleted from the settlement boundary.**

2.a.1. See the Settlement Overview, paragraphs c to j, which explains the rationale for the inclusion of the site and generally for the limitations placed on development at Gwbert.

**3. Point 3**

**3.a. The status of the 1920s and 1930s housing cluster between Seabank and Charlsbey on Coronation Drive should be recognised in the settlement boundary either with the intervening land included (42/C) or as a separate nucleated cluster.**

3.a.1. See Section IV, 'Settlement Overview', paragraph k, which explains the purpose of the development boundary in the UDP and emphasises that this has no bearing on the practical or administrative status of these houses as a clearly recognised part of Gwbert.

**4. Point 4**

**4.a. The Settlement Statement is inaccurate in respect of the existence of a bus service and in the summary of facilities.**

4.a.1. The LPA proposes a further change at PC 297, to delete the second paragraph from 'Facilities within Gwbert ...' to 'bus route' and to replace the text with that supplied by Objector R5789 in their proof A674.

Proposed Changes Objections and LPA Responses

**101. The accuracy of the revised Settlement Statement in respect of a public sewer is challenged.**

101.a.1. See Point 1 above.

## VI. Conclusion

Further Proposed Changes

### VI.a. The LPA propose the following further amendments the Settlement Statement (PC 297.001):

<p><b>PC 297.001</b></p>	<p>Gwbert comprises over 70 dwellings. To the south of the settlement is a cluster of dwellings which forms an isolated development within the open countryside. <del>Facilities within Gwbert itself are limited, although within the immediate vicinity are found a number of caravan and camping establishments, a yacht club, golf club with squash courts, and two hotels. It is not on a bus route.</del> <i>Facilities within Gwbert itself include two hotels, two golf courses, squash courts, and the Cardigan Island Wildlife Centre. At Pen-yr-Ergyd there is a static caravan park and the Teifi Boating Club. Gwbert is on the Cardigan-Ferwig bus route.</i></p>
	<p>Infrastructure  <b>Part of the settlement has public sewers.</b> Development <del>should be</del> is subject to <del>installation of an</del> <i>completion of adequate appropriate sewerage system infrastructure.</i></p>

### VI.b. The Inspector is invited to approve for adoption in relation to the settlement of Gwbert, the Deposit Version of Settlement Inset Map No 42 and the Settlement Statement (as amended by PC 297 and further amended by PC 297.001).

## Appendix 1

## List of Objections by Objectors

Representation Numbers	Names of Respondents	Settlement Inset No.	Site Ref Num	Addressed by Paragraph Number			PC Number to Meet Issue
				Settlement Overview	Section V	Appendix	
R/5016 B/50700 PC/297	Mr E & Mrs S H Daniel	049			Para 101 and Point 1		N/C
R/5021 B/50346 PC/297	Messrs James Templeton & Mary Marsden	049			Para 101 and Point 1		N/C
R/5026 S/30028	Cyngor Cymuned Y Ferwig Community Council	049		Support			N/A
R/5224 S/35687	Environment Agency Wales	049		Support			N/A
R/5241 B/32004	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	049				Apx 5. para 1.1 and 2.1	PC 297
R/5793 B/50328 PC/297	Mr Mark Stephen Davies	049			Para 101 and Point 1		N/C
R/5795 B/32012	Mr David Jonathan Wynne Evans	049			Point 1	Apx 5, para 1.3	N/C
R/5016 B/30016	Mr E & Mrs S H Daniel	049	49/A	Paras e, g - j	Points 1 & 2	Appx 5, paras 1.2 – 1.4, 1.5 – 1.7	N/C
R/5021 B/30021	Messrs James Templeton & Mary Marsden	049	49/A	Paras e, f, g - j	Points 1 & 2	Appx 5, paras 1.2 – 1.4, 1.5 – 1.7	N/C

R/5023 B/30023	Mrs Sybil Anita Matthews	049	49/A	Paras e, g - j	Points 1 & 2	Appx 5, paras 1.2 – 1.4, 1.5 – 1.7, 2.2	N/C
R/5791 B/32008	Miss Sian Llwyd Edwards	049	49/A		Point 1	Appx 5, para 1.3, 2.2	
R/5793 B/32010	Mr Mark Stephen Davies	049	49/A	Paras e, f, g - j	Points 1 & 2	Appx 5, paras 1.2 – 1.4, 1.5 – 1.7	N/C
R/5796 B/32013	Residents of Gwbert (Petitioners)	049	49/A	Paras e, g - j	Points 1 & 2	Appx 5, paras 1.2 – 1.4, 1.5 – 1.7, 2.2	N/C
R/5789 B/32006	Mr & Mrs Colin & Pam Osborne	049	49/C	Paras b, g - k	Points 3 & 4	Appx 5, paras 1.5 – 1.7, 2.3	

(R= Respondent Number, Representation Number S= Support B= Objection, PC= Proposed Change Number)

(~~R/9999 B/99999 PC/000~~ ~~A Another~~ = Conditional Withdrawal of Objection)

(~~R/9999 B/99999 PC/000~~ ~~A Another~~ = Unconditional Withdrawal of Objection)

## Appendix 2

### Representations received to the UDP Deposit Version

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Cyngor Cymuned Y Ferwig Community Council
<b>Respondent Number</b>	R/5026
<b>Agent (Y or N)</b>	N
<b>Contact Name</b>	Mr B J Gooch
<b>Contact Position and Company (if applicable)</b>	Clerc/Clerk
<b>Contact Address</b>	Talar Wen, Ferwig, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PX
<b>Admin Number</b>	D/290
<b>Representation Number</b>	S/30028
<b>Summary</b>	Support for the development boundary of Gwbert.
<b>Respondent Name</b>	Environment Agency Wales
<b>Respondent Number</b>	R/5224
<b>Agent (Y or N)</b>	N
<b>Contact Name</b>	Ms L Edwards
<b>Contact Position and Company (if applicable)</b>	Planning Liaison Environment Agency Wales
<b>Contact Address</b>	Hawthorn Rise, Haverfordwest Pembrokeshire SA61 2BQ
<b>Admin Number</b>	D/942
<b>Representation Number</b>	S/35687
<b>Summary</b>	Environment Agency made no adverse comment.
<b>Respondent Name</b>	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water
<b>Respondent Number</b>	R/5241
<b>Agent (Y or N)</b>	N
<b>Contact Name</b>	Mr D R Bowen
<b>Contact Position and Company (if applicable)</b>	Network Development Manager ( South )
<b>Contact Address</b>	Network Development Consultants, Hyder Consulting Ltd, P O Box 10, Treharris Cardiff CF46 6XZ
<b>Admin Number</b>	D/925
<b>Representation Number</b>	B/32004
<b>Summary</b>	Objection to Infrastructure section of settlement statement for Gwbert. Replace existing text with, "Part of the settlement has public sewers".
<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mr David Jonathan Wynne Evans
<b>Respondent Number</b>	R/5795
<b>Agent (Y or N)</b>	N
<b>Contact Name</b>	Mr D J W Evans
<b>Contact Position and Company (if applicable)</b>	

**Contact Address** Ty Wynne, Gwbert, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PR

**Admin Number** D/535

**Representation Number** B/32012

**Summary** Objection to any additional development in Gwbert.  
Reasons:  
Pressure on drainage infrastructure and unlikely resolution of sewerage problem for 10 years.  
  
No development before sewerage infrastructure improved.

**Respondent Name** Mr E & Mrs S H Daniel

**Respondent Number** R/5016

**Agent (Y or N)** N

**Contact Name** Mrs S H Daniel

**Contact Position and Company (if applicable)**

**Contact Address** Alkerton, Gwbert, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PR

**Admin Number** D/235

**Representation Number** B/30016

**Summary** Objection to any additional development in Gwbert.  
Reasons:  
At Site 49/A, adverse impact on coastal landscape and visual amenity of the coast for residents and visitors  
Road safety concerns  
Pressure on sewerage infrastructure  
Potential loss of private recreational facilities (hotel golf course).  
Petition included with duplicate correspondence (in time)

**Respondent Name** Messrs James Templeton & Mary Marsden

**Respondent Number** R/5021

**Agent (Y or N)** N

**Contact Name** Messrs J T & M Marsden

**Contact Position and Company (if applicable)**

**Contact Address** Island View, Gwbert-on-Sea, Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PR

**Admin Number** D/242

**Representation Number** B/30021

**Summary** Objection to any additional 'high density' development in Gwbert.  
Reasons:  
At Site 49/A, adverse impact on coastal landscape/environment (adjacent SSSI)  
Adverse impact on visual amenity of the coast for residents and very importantly for tourists.  
Road safety concerns (existing congestion in season already results in regular minor accidents)  
Pressure on drainage infrastructure (gives evidence including photographs of specific problems with underlying water course) and pollution risk.  
Development cost in high price bracket inconsistent with plan/servicing local need.  
Quotes previous refusal on appeal to planning inspector.  
  
No further development unless the road infrastructure is improved; a new sewage system is put in place linked to the Cardigan outfall; any development is low density, single storey; existing tourist attractions are well maintained.

**Respondent Name** Mrs Sybil Anita Matthews

**Respondent Number** R/5023

**Agent (Y or N)** N

**Contact Name** Mrs S A Matthews

**Contact Position and Company (if applicable)**

**Contact Address** Four Winds, Gwbert-On-Sea, Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PR

**Admin Number** D/277

**Representation Number** B/30023

**Summary** Objection to development at Site 49/A in Gwbert.  
Reasons:  
Adverse impact on coastal landscape and visual amenity of the coast for residents and very importantly for tourists.  
Recent high density development is inconsistent with existing pattern of 'scattered' development and do not wish to see any more of same.  
Road safety concerns (existing congestion in season already results in regular minor accidents)  
Pressure on drainage infrastructure (gives evidence including photographs of specific problems with underlying water course) and pollution risk.  
Development cost in high price bracket inconsistent with plan/servicing local need.  
Quotes previous refusal on appeal to planning inspector.

Exclude Site 49/A from the development boundary. Consider alternative sites away from the coastline.

**Respondent Name** Miss Sian Llwyd Edwards

**Respondent Number** R/5791

**Agent (Y or N)** Y

**Contact Name** c/o Mr LI Edwards

**Contact Position and Company (if applicable)** Principal c/o Llwyd Edwards Architect

**Contact Address** The Old Stables, St Mary Street, Aberteifi / Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1HA

**Admin Number** D/1755

**Representation Number** B/32008

**Summary** Objection to inclusion of Site 49/A, within the development boundary for Gwbert  
Reasons:  
Storm water from the site runs into objector's land at Site 49/B and development will exacerbate the flooding problem and potential damage to objector's property.

Exclude Site 49/A from development boundary for Gwbert.

**Respondent Name** Mr Mark Stephen Davies

**Respondent Number** R/5793

**Agent (Y or N)** N

**Contact Name** Mr M S Davies

**Contact Position and Company (if applicable)**

**Contact Address** Llywenydd, Gwbert, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PP

**Admin Number** D/543

**Representation Number** B/32010

**Summary** Objection to any additional development in Gwbert.  
Reasons:  
Adverse impact on visual amenity of the coast for residents and very importantly for tourists.  
Road safety concerns  
Pressure on drainage infrastructure and pollution risk.  
Development cost in high price bracket inconsistent with plan/servicing local need.

No further development in Gwbert.

**Respondent Name** Residents of Gwbert (Petitioners)  
**Respondent Number** R/5796  
**Agent (Y or N)** N  
**Contact Name** Messrs E Daniel  
**Contact Position and Company (if applicable)**  
**Contact Address** Alkerton, Gwbert on Sea, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PR  
**Admin Number** D/514  
**Representation Number** B/32013  
**Summary** Objection to the inclusion of Site 49/A within the development boundary of Gwbert.  
Reasons:  
Petition from settlement residents, citing:  
Concerns for road safety (including photographic illustrations)  
Environmental considerations: saturation from existing septic tank soakaways with attendant pollution risk upon further development.  
Properties likely to be high cost and to add to existing holiday home development, with adverse impact on the community.  
  
Exclude Site 42/A from the development boundary for Gwbert.

**Respondent Name** Mr & Mrs Colin & Pam Osborne  
**Respondent Number** R/5789  
**Agent (Y or N)** N  
**Contact Name** Mr & Mrs C & P Osborne  
**Contact Position and Company (if applicable)**  
**Contact Address** Headland, Gwbert, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PP  
**Admin Number** D/1231  
**Representation Number** B/32006  
**Summary** Objection to the settlement boundary of Gwbert.  
Reasons:  
It excludes a group of houses that represent 12% of the community, based on UDP housing numbers. The rationale is unclear as they were established in the 1920's and fall within the Gwbert road signs. To the south of these houses is an unbroken expanse of land, lying immediately south of the village boundary. The northern edge of this land is marked by the Gwbert village identifier on Coronation Drive and would be a much more natural reflection of historic development of Gwbert and would represent the reality of current village extremities and the built up community.  
  
Amend the boundary to include Site 49/C to more accurately reflect the historic development and current reality of the built up extremities of the settlement.

## Appendix 3

### Representations received to the UDP Proposed Changes Document

<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mr E & Mrs S H Daniel
<b>Respondent Number</b>	R/5016
<b>Agent (Y or N)</b>	N
<b>Contact Name</b>	Mrs S H Daniel
<b>Contact Position and Company (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Contact Address</b>	Alkerton, Gwbert, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PR
<b>Admin Number</b>	C/5286
<b>Representation Number</b>	B/50700
<b>Summary</b>	Duly Made objection challenging the accuracy of the new text in the 'Infrastructure' section of the statement with regard to the presence of public sewers. Evidence supplied that certain premises supposed to be on route of sewer have septic tanks. Noted that original objection re Gwbert is maintained. (Clarification of representation by telephone 3 June 2004).
<b>Respondent Name</b>	Messrs James Templeton & Mary Marsden
<b>Respondent Number</b>	R/5021
<b>Agent (Y or N)</b>	N
<b>Contact Name</b>	Messrs J T & M Marsden
<b>Contact Position and Company (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Contact Address</b>	Island View, Gwbert-on-Sea, Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PR
<b>Admin Number</b>	C/5071
<b>Representation Number</b>	B/50346
<b>Summary</b>	Duly made objection to proposed text change, 'Part of the settlement has public sewers'. Suggests this is inaccurate and sentence be deleted.  Also note not duly made comment that Gwbert is on a bus route and reiteration of points raised in original objection at Deposit Stage which will be referred to Inquiry on that basis.
<b>Respondent Name</b>	Mr Mark Stephen Davies
<b>Respondent Number</b>	R/5793
<b>Agent (Y or N)</b>	N
<b>Contact Name</b>	Mr M S Davies
<b>Contact Position and Company (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Contact Address</b>	Llywenydd, Gwbert, Aberteifi/Cardigan Ceredigion SA43 1PP
<b>Admin Number</b>	C/5006
<b>Representation Number</b>	B/50328
<b>Summary</b>	Objection to insertion of text 'Part of the settlement has public sewers' because it offers a false impression of the sewerage services in the settlement. The reality is that the bulk of the settlement relies on disposal to septic tank and that the public sewer discharges raw sewage to an outfall at the coast. Suggests EITHER that the settlement statement should clarify the total number of houses connected to a public sewer and that this discharges untreated sewage into

the sea OR that the proposed change text 'Part of settlement has public sewer' should be deleted.

## Appendix 4

### Extract from Topic Paper 2 : Settlement Strategy and Site Selection, Section 5

#### (CD 255)

#### 5.0 The Provision of land within individual settlements to reflect the Settlement Strategy

- 5.1. Having defined each settlements role within the hierarchy and hence the appropriate level of development it was necessary to identify the land requirement.
- 5.2. To a certain extent the procedure of identifying land which may be suitable to accommodate residential growth is not completely separate from that of identifying the spatial distribution of growth. The availability of sites for development had already, to some extent, formed part of the consideration when determining the Settlement Strategy. The general availability of sites would have had a bearing as to whether or not a settlement could accommodate further growth. The following section sets out how land within each of the settlements listed in the Appendix to Volume 2B has been identified.

#### The Search Sequence: Identifying land to include within the Settlement

##### Boundaries of individual settlements:

- 5.3. National Planning Guidance sets out criteria which should be considered in identifying sites capable of accommodating residential development <sup>1</sup>. These criteria cover issues such as the:
  - a Availability of previously used sites, under-used or empty buildings;
  - b Location and accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car;
  - c Capacity of existing and potential infrastructure (public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure);
  - d Ability of communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including the Welsh language; and
  - e Physical and environmental constraints on developing land (e.g. contamination, stability, flood risk, impact of climate change, location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes).
- 5.4. Taking into account this guidance and local information, such as, school numbers and sewerage capacity, to locally quantify these criteria, Local Members and officers used their local knowledge to determine which sites were to be considered as suitable for development; this included site visits where necessary.
- 5.5. Within many of the settlements, sites already existed which had a valid residential planning consent. The nature of these sites (the number of units capable of being accommodated along with their genuine availability) has been taken into account in

<sup>1</sup> *Planning Policy Wales, March 2002, Para 9.2.7 and 9.2.8. In addition much of the guidance in Para 9.2.2 was also taken into account (considered relevant).*

determining how much additional land is needed in order to accommodate the overall housing requirement for individual settlements.

- 5.6. Based on the search sequence set out by National Guidance, Local Members and officers considered the potential for the re-use of existing buildings or previously used land as the first option for meeting future need<sup>2</sup>. Consideration was then given to whether any spaces remain undeveloped within the settlement itself, or whether gaps remain available within the existing frontages (infill). Where the existing settlement form offered no or little opportunity for further development through infill or remaining spaces in the built form, consideration had to next be given to sites that existed at the edge of the settlement, adjoining the existing built form.
- 5.7. Where consideration had to be given to adding land on the edge of existing settlements a choice of sites was often apparent. Where this was the case, Local Members and officers had to evaluate which sites were the most appropriate. This required the consideration of further issues such as:
- a The site's relationship to the existing built form;
  - b Whether the site consolidates the form of the village without encouraging ribboning;
  - c The visual impact of the site on the character of the settlement and the wider countryside;
  - d The location of the site in relation to the services and facilities available within the settlement;
  - e The accessibility of the site, both pedestrian and vehicular;
  - f Any physical constraints associated with the site; and
  - g The potential to help provide for a range of housing needs within the settlement (e.g. within some of the larger settlements, where a choice of a number of large sites and several single plots existed, a mix of both was considered necessary in many instances, whereas in the smaller settlements, the large sites would have been disregarded as they would have been out of character with the settlement).
- 5.8. Sites which performed the best when considered against these criteria were subsequently included within the UDP defined settlement boundaries.

#### **Allocating Sites for Residential Development:**

- 5.9. The inclusion of land within a Settlement Boundary does not safeguard the land for residential development. To safeguard land to ensure that it is only developed for residential purposes it is necessary to specifically allocate the land for residential development.
- 5.10. In general, sites have only been specifically allocated for housing within the six main towns (with a couple of exceptions). Within towns competition for land is at its greatest. In order to ensure that an acceptable level of housing can be provided within the towns it is therefore necessary to specifically allocate sites. In addition, there will

<sup>2</sup> *Planning Policy Wales, March 2002, Para 9.2.7.*

be opportunity for residential development within the towns on non-allocated sites, through the conversion of existing buildings and from windfall or small sites. For settlements other than the six main towns, generally no specific sites have been identified for residential development. Within these settlements, the use of allocations in the past has proved to be too rigid.

- 5.11. It has been suggested during the plan process that sites should be specifically allocated to meet the housing needs of 'local people'. It would be contrary to guidance to allocate sites purely on the basis that it should provide housing for 'local people' only without any further qualification<sup>3</sup>. Equally the LPA consider that it would also be inappropriate and unfeasible to allocate sites specifically to deal with 'special housing requirements', such as 'affordable housing'. This is because the range of such 'special housing requirements' is wide and likely to change over the plan period. It is also inappropriate to 'ghettoise' specific groups of people into specific locations. The policies contained within the plan are, however, considered to be flexible enough to deal with such special circumstances when and where they arise.

#### **The role of settlement boundaries:**

- 5.12. Settlement boundaries have then been defined for each of the settlements included in groups (a) and (b) set out in Para 4.2 above (these are the settlements listed in the Appendix to Volume 2B). The settlement boundary defines the limits within which development may, subject to the relevant policies, be appropriate. Settlement boundaries therefore provide an indication of the area within which residential development may be possible. This does not mean however that all the land included within the settlement boundary will be developed for housing as will be explained in the following paragraphs. Land outside of the settlement boundary is referred to as the open countryside, where development is permitted only in exceptional circumstances.
- 5.13. Settlement boundaries coupled with policies H1.2 – H1.3 and the Appendix to Volume 2B, have an important contribution to make in meeting the objectives of the plan, including:
- a To ensure that enough land is genuinely available to meet the plan's housing aim of providing for the housing requirement that arises during the plan period in full;
  - b To aid competition in land as a commodity and so to keep the value under some sort of control; and
  - c To allow for further 'local need' provision (over and above the figure set out in the Appendix to Volume 2B) where it can be demonstrated that there is a positive benefit to the community taking into account the Welsh language.
- 5.14. To ensure that over development does not take place the Appendix to Volume 2B sets out the number of units acceptable for each settlement. It is this figure that will guide the level of development that is permitted within each settlement and not the amount of land included within the settlement boundary. Where development is proposed beyond this figure it must be demonstrated that the development will benefit the settlement and community [policy GEN3.1 and CER1.1].

<sup>3</sup> *Planning Policy Wales, March 2002, Para. 9.2.5.*

- 5.15. Not all land included within a settlement boundary is genuinely available, or appropriate, for development. Settlement boundaries encompass areas of land which either cannot be developed, such as castles or floodplains, or land which it is not desirable to develop such as playgrounds. Policies are contained within the plan to ensure that such land is protected from development. In addition, a certain proportion of land, though considered appropriate for development, may not necessarily come forward during the plan period due to unforeseen constraints such as ownership or access issues. This possibility has been taken into account when identifying land for inclusion across the County. In many of the settlements sites have not been specifically allocated. Within the towns themselves the absence of a prescribed number of units for each allocated site provides the flexibility required to ensure that the identified need can be met. Where, for example, constraints become apparent with regard to a particular allocated site within a town, it is possible to address this through increasing the required density of proposed development elsewhere within the town. Within the towns infill sites and re-use of existing buildings will also help address any potential shortfalls.
- 5.16. In towns less land has been included in proportion to the potential housing provision, compared with rural settlements, because a higher density of development will be expected. It should however be noted that the same density is not expected of each site, rather a combination is considered more appropriate. This approach is in line with PPW, March 2002, Para 2.5.3 which advises that higher density development be encouraged in urban areas and in other locations which are, or can be, well served by public transport, or can be reached by walking or cycling. Elsewhere within the County, the amount of land included in relation to the housing provision will vary according to existing form and character of the village and its overall role both in the immediate and wider community. For example, the most rural settlements will be characterised by larger amounts of land, this is because new dwellings within these settlements will require a more dispersed approach, in terms of location and layout, in keeping with what is already there. Thus in identifying what amount of land to include within the individual settlements, the LPA have not applied any form of standard densities. It was more appropriate to consider each settlement individually and include sufficient land to ensure that the character of the settlement is not compromised by inappropriate development forms and layouts.

## Appendix 5

### 1.0 Gwbert Response

- 1.1. The request for amendments to the settlement statement regarding public sewer concerns issues of clarity and should be incorporated.
- 1.2. It is acknowledged that some of the land may be subject to constraints, such as infrastructure or access, or could have potential impacts on for example landscape visual amenity. The production of the UDP has involved and continues to involve cooperation and on-going discussion between various service deliverers and organisations to ensure that potential constraints or impacts, where possible, can be addressed, minimised or avoided. There is also an opportunity at the application stage to reconsider any potential impacts or constraints. A number of policies are included within the plan to prevent or minimise such impacts where they may occur, by requiring mitigation measures or improvements to take place as part of the development or by preventing development from taking place until the constraint issues have been appropriately addressed.
- 1.3. The Settlement Statement already contains a reference to the lack of capacity within the sewerage system and the need for improvement. In addition policies (GEN4.1 and ENVU1.2) are contained within the plan to ensure that adequate capacity exists within the sewerage system before development is permitted. The reference contained in the Settlement Statement along with the policies is considered sufficient to provide for the consideration of infrastructure constraints at the time of an application. It is not necessary to remove or reduce the level of land contained in the plan on the basis of sewerage infrastructure constraints as improvements are feasible during the plan period either through the Sewerage Undertakers 5 yearly improvement plans or through developer contributions.
- 1.4. The consideration of highway issues within this settlement are more appropriate at the application stage and do not justify the removal of sites from the UDP.
- 1.5. The amount of land included within the settlement boundary of Gwbert is considered appropriate to meet the potential level of housing growth proposed during the UDP plan period as proposed by the settlement strategy. The purpose of the UDP settlement boundary is not to define the historic settlement but to set the furthest limits within which development may be considered against UDP policies for the period of the plan. In the case of Gwbert, this is extremely limited. New development is directed primarily to Cardigan. The sites that have been included are based on the consideration of potential sites in relation to guidance that exists on site selection. Guidance sets out criteria which should be considered as part of a search sequence in identifying sites for potential future residential development (PPW, March 2002, Para 9.2.7 and 9.2.8, in addition much of the criteria set out in 9.2.2 is also relevant). Issues that should be considered, according to guidance, include the following:
  - a Availability of previously used sites, under-used or empty buildings;
  - b Location and accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car;
  - c Capacity of existing and potential infrastructure (public transport, water and sewerage, other utilities and social infrastructure);
  - d The ability of communities to support new physical and social infrastructure, including the Welsh language;

- e Physical and environmental constraints on developing land (e.g. contamination, stability, flood risk, impact of climate change, location of fragile habitats and species, archaeological and historic sites and landscapes).
- 1.6. Based on the search sequence set out in PPW, March 2002, Para 9.2.7 members and officers considered the potential for the re-use of existing buildings or previously used land as the first option, followed by the potential for growth to be met by spaces or gaps in frontages that remain undeveloped within existing built form of the settlement. Where no opportunity remained for such infill within the existing built form, sites on the edge of but adjoining the settlement were considered next. Where a choice of new sites existed for inclusion the following criteria was considered by the LPA in addition to that set out above:
- a Relationship to existing built form;
  - b Whether it consolidates the form of the village without encouraging ribboning;
  - c Visual impact of the site on the character of the settlement and the wider countryside;
  - d Location in relation to the services and facilities available within the settlement;
  - e Accessibility, both pedestrian and vehicular;
  - f Physical constraints of the site;
  - g Potential to contribute towards the range of housing needs which need to be met within the settlement;
  - h Genuine availability of the land (no ownership constraints etc.).
- 1.7. The sites included within the UDP were therefore those which performed best when considered against all of the above criteria.

## **2.0 Gwbert Proposed Change:**

- 2.1. Replace existing text of Settlement Statement, Infrastructure section, with, "Part of the settlement has public sewers."
- 2.2. Site 42/A: Do not delete from the development boundary.
- 2.3. Site 49/C: Do not amend the boundary to include the site.

## Appendix 6

### Minutes of Area Settlement Panel 1<sup>st</sup> December 2003 (Extract) and Full Council 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2003

Notes of a Meeting of the UDP Area Settlement Panel  
(South) held on Monday 1 December 2003

PRESENT: Councillor D Ll Evans (Chairman), Councillors T J Adams-Lewis, J E Davies, E J K Evans, T E Evans, Dr J G Jenkins, A Ll Jones, L Ll Jones, T H Lewis, S M Morris, J D Thomas and A Wilson.

9.00 am – 1.00 pm

1 Apologies  
Councillor R P Quant MBE apologised for his inability to attend the meeting.

#### 2 **Disclosure of Personal Interests**

The Monitoring Officer drew the Panel's attention to the requirements of the Local Code of Conduct with regard to disclosures of personal interest and circulated the written advice distributed at the previous Area Panel Meetings in 2001. She advised that, in accordance with the Local Code of Conduct, it was the personal responsibility of each Member to disclose any personal interest in parcels of land being discussed at today's meeting or any other matter falling within the Local Code and referred to the following provision in Paragraph 20 of the Local Code of Conduct that "Members must exercise personal responsibility in deciding whether they have a personal interest such that they should disclose it. They may seek advice from the Authority's Monitoring Officer and must have regard to any advice from the relevant Standards Committee in doing so".

The following Members disclosed personal interests under the paragraphs of the Local Code of Conduct as indicated in respect of the parcels of land as listed and left the Council Chamber during the consideration of that parcel of land:

Name of Member	Local Code Paragraph	Parcel of Land
D Ll Evans	11(a)	Land at Ferwig
A Ll Jones	11(a)	Land at Blaenannerch
S M Morris	11(a)	Land at Cardigan* and Llechryd [*dispensation given to speak but not to vote]
R E Thomas	12(b)	Cardigan Hospital

[Russell Hughes-Pickering also declared an interest in land at Beulah and left the Council Chamber during consideration thereof.]

#### 3 **Report of the Director of Environmental Services and Housing**

The Assistant Director of Environmental Services (Town and Country Planning Services) introduced the Report prepared for consideration by the Panel. He reminded the Panel of the details of the process to date for the preparation of the UDP.

Draft policies had been developed with cabinet; settlement matters had been considered with ward members. A draft plan had been produced for consultation & agreed by Council. Consultation responses had been considered by cabinet (policy matters) and area settlement panels. A deposit version for further consultation was produced and agreed by Council. Responses to policy matters in

the deposit version of the udp had been considered by cabinet. The purpose of this area settlement panel was to consider site specific responses.

He stated that it would be the Deposit Version that would be considered by the Inspector at the Public Inquiry. Where possible however the authority should seek to identify potential changes which could overcome objections raised. The changes & any further public response to them would be put before the Inspector. The aim of this stage was therefore to identify informal changes that would resolve as many objections as possible prior to the Inquiry, making it more likely that later stages in the process could be speeded up, become more efficient and less costly. He stated that it was important however, when considering changes, to be aware that counter objections could be made to the changes and therefore make the process less efficient and more costly. In most settlements no proposed changes were recommended.

Any proposed changes would be subject to further public consultation early in the new year.

The recommendations of the area settlement panels, together with appropriate changes to the settlement statements and maps, would then be reported to Council in December. Once agreed the proposed changes would be made available for consultation and those responses would be reported to the Inquiry along with the representations currently being considered.

The Principal Planner (Forward Planning) then explained to the Panel the information contained in Appendices A – E, namely

Appendix A summarises the representations in text form, together with a proposed Local Authority response. Depending upon the nature of the representations made, the response sets out the settlement strategy in the UDP and how the settlement relates to it. The approach to site selection is then set out, with an assessment of whether sites currently in the boundary best fulfil the site selection criteria or not.

Appendix B, illustrates the representations made to the Council on relevant settlement maps.

Appendix C, illustrates suggested proposed changes to settlement maps (A4 size maps) and other text in Volume 2a of the plan, including the settlement statements, which have been amended.

Appendix D, illustrates suggested proposed changes to settlement maps (A3 size maps) and other text, such as the settlement statements, which have been amended.

Appendix E, is a copy of the paper on housing issues presented to Cabinet when discussing policy representations. This is included to avoid duplicating discussions about housing figures and other issues.

The Chairman then invited the Officers to introduce the settlements in turn. The agreed proposed changes for reporting to Council are listed below for the settlements as discussed at the meeting:

**Gwbert Proposed Change:**

- Replace existing text of Settlement Statement, Infrastructure section, with, "Part of the settlement has public sewers."
- Site 42/A: Do not delete from the development boundary.
- Site 49/C: Do not amend the boundary to include the site.?

Minutes of a **Special Meeting** of **CEREDIGION COUNTY COUNCIL** held at the Council Chamber,  
Neuadd Cyngor Ceredigion, Penmorfa, Aberaeron on **Monday 22 December 2003**

PRESENT:- Councillor S.M. Thomas (Chairman); Councillors T.J. Adams-Lewis,  
E.E. ap Gwynn, W.G. Bennett, E.W. Davies, J.E. Davies, J.T.O. Davies, W.R. Edwards,  
P.W. Eklund, D.J. Evans, D.Ll. Evans, E.J.K. Evans, H.G. Evans, T.E. Evans, E.J. Griffiths,  
S.G. Hopley, D.M. James, W.P. James, Dr. J.G Jenkins, A.Ll. Jones, L.Ll. Jones, T.J. Jones,  
T.H. Lewis, C. Llwyd, S.M. Morris, R.P. Quant MBE, S.H. Richards, T.A. Thomas, J.I. Williams and A.  
Wilson.

(10.00 a.m. – 1.50 p.m.)

352 **Apologies**

Councillors B L Davies, Ll G Edwards, G Ellis, P James, R G Harries, H T Jones, J D R Jones MBE,  
E O Rees, Ll M Roberts-Young, J D Thomas, R E Thomas, A Williams and E C Williams  
apologised for their inability to attend the Meeting.

353 **Disclosure of Personal Interest**

The Chairman asked the Monitoring Officer for advice on disclosures of interest after explaining that  
the meeting would deal firstly with the general policy document and then the recommendations  
relating to the site specific matters.

Reference was made by the Officer to an earlier Counsel's opinion which had been referred to  
previously following the April 2002 Council meeting.

On the basis that the policy document dealt with 'broad brush' policy of the Council and that would  
not deal with any site specific issues and would not refer or affect the inclusion or exclusion of land  
then any interest would be considered to be too remote and therefore they did not have a  
disqualifying interest.

Turning to the area panels recommendations to Council and discussion relating to site specific issues  
then members must disclose an interest in line with the provisions of the Local Code and reference  
was made to the previous written note given to all Members.

However the Monitoring Officer emphasised their personal responsibility to disclose their interest  
and that Officers would not know or be aware of all their interests and Members were referred to the  
requirements of paragraph 20 of the Local Code that they 'must exercise personal responsibility in  
deciding whether they have a personal interest such that they should disclose it. They may seek from  
the Authority's Monitoring Officer and must have regard to any advice from the relevant Standards  
Committee in doing so'.

The following Members disclosed personal interests under the paragraphs of the Local Code of  
Conduct as indicated and left the Council Chamber when those reports of the Area Panels or policy  
matters were debated and voted upon.

<b>Name Of Member</b>	<b>Local Code Paragraph</b>	<b>Parcel of Land / Policy Matter</b>
E E ap Gwynn	11(b) 11(a)	All UWA land Vale of Rheidol Railway land
J T O Davies	11(a)	Land at Betws Bledrws
W R Edwards	13(f)	65D Llangwryfon
P W Eklund	12(b)	Land at Glanyrafon, Aberystwyth
D J Evans	11(a)	007/A Betws Bledrws
D Ll Evans	11(a) 11(a)	Land at Tregaron Land at Ferwig. Policy T <del>R</del> R3.5
E J K Evans	11(a)	Economic Development land at 152/E1 and 152/B Groesffordd, Llandysul
H G Evans	11(a)	Land at Devil's Bridge
T E Evans	11(a)	Land at Llangoedmor
E J Griffiths	11(a)	Mill Street car park, Aberystwyth
S G Hopley	11(a)	Shop at New Quay Land at Llwyncelyn
D M James	14(a) 11(a) 14(b)	135/A or H Llanrhystud 134/F Llansantffraid 105/B Tanerdy

	11(a)	125/A/G Llanfihangel Ystrad
	11(a)	Aberaeron Hospital and proposed Health Centre
W P James	11(a)	House and land at Llandre
	13(a)	All UWA land
	12(b)	Rhydypennau Hall
	11(a)	Shop in Bridge Street, Aberystwyth
A Ll Jones	11(a)	House and business at Llanfarian
	12(b)	Llanfarian Village Hall
	12(c)	Llanfarian C P School
C Llwyd	11(a)	Land at Talgarreg
S M Morris	11(a)	Land at Cardigan and Llechryd Policy TR2.2
S H Richards	11(a)	Land at Cellan (A) Land at Pont Creuddyn
S M Thomas	11(a)	Land adjoining house at Ciliau Aeron
T A Thomas	11(a)	Land at Penrhynoch
J I Williams	12(b)	Site 151/K Lampeter

### 354 Unitary Development Plan Preparation

Consideration was given to the Report of the Director of Environmental Services and Housing on the action taken to date to consider making proposed changes to the Deposit Version of the UDP following the consideration of responses to policies and site specific matters during the consultation process. The Assistant Director of Environmental Services and Housing (Town and Country Planning) reminded Council of the action taken to date since Cabinet agreed a timetable at its meeting held on 9 September 2003 and it was noted that Cabinet had considered representations made in respect of the policies contained in the Deposit Version of the UDP on 9/23 October (Part 1, Housing, Employment and Shopping Chapters), 4 November (Environment Chapter), 18 November (Environment (contd.) and Tourism Chapters), 25 November (Community, Education and Recreation Chapter and Transport Chapter) 10 December (Amendments to policies H2.2, H1.4 and CER1.1 that could be applicable when considering local affordable housing in rural areas ) and 16 December 2003 (all policies). Area Settlement Panels had also met on five occasions to consider site-specific representations, namely on 26 November (Mid East except Tregaron), 27 November (North), 1 December (South and Mid West) and 10 December (Tregaron). The proposed changes agreed at all these meeting and being recommended for reporting to the Inspector at the Public Inquiry were included in the papers circulated with the Report and had been highlighted for ease of reference. An addendum of corrections was also circulated at the Meeting. Council was therefore invited to agree these proposed changes as recommended by Cabinet and the Area Panels. It was explained that these changes would be the subject of further consultation and that counter objections could be received. It was stated that it was still aimed to hold the Public Inquiry in June or July 2004

As requested by Cabinet, papers containing information on the following were circulated at the Meeting. The Monitoring Officer advised that Council may wish to adjourn for some half an hour to

digest the contents of the papers but it was agreed to request the Officers to present the papers without an adjournment. The following was reported upon by the Officers:

- Planning Policy relating to Local Needs Housing including an extract from Planning Policy Wales, an extract from research undertaken for the National Assembly on 'Second and holiday homes and the land use planning system' and details of policies being formulated or implemented in Local Authorities and National Park Authorities in England and Wales.

There followed a discussion on this matter and it was noted that

- there was no separate guidance to National Park Authorities
- several Authorities were at different stages of preparing their UDPs
- all had policies relating to affordable housing and/or affordable housing to meet local needs, similar to policies H2.2 and, in some cases, H1.4 in the Council's UDP. Only the Lake District National Park Authority had an adopted policy relating to 'locals only' housing and overall housing need had to be met in the Development Plans of surrounding local authorities.

It was agreed that the vote on the adoption of the proposed changes to the policy chapters be made by way of a recorded vote.

The Council then discussed each policy chapter in turn and clarification given on certain matters raised by several Members, including:

- the wording of ENVL1.4 – level of protection of agricultural land
- the protection of the characteristics of the built environment of coastal villages
- the production of a design guide
- ENVB1.16 and 1.17 – potential light pollution
- ENVB1.20 – Bilingual signs – the wording was stronger than that contained in the Guidance
- Use of uPVC on Listed Buildings – contained in separate advice/supplementary guidance
- ENVP2.1 – Flooding. It was noted that the advice of the Environment Agency on flood risk areas was a guide to be used by the Local Planning Authority in a responsible manner when dealing with planning applications
- Utilities – the need to press Dwr Cymru to proceed with their investment programme
- E3.3 - Re-use, conversion or extension of agricultural and/or other rural buildings. There was a need for case officers to use their professional judgement when dealing with each application to interpret the need for the applicant to exhaust possible business re-use.
- TR3.1 →Change agreed as proposed in Addendum.
- Housing Chapter. In reply to comments from Councillor W P James, the Assistant Director of Environmental Services and Housing (Town and Country Planning) outlined the type of Housing Needs Assessment which had been commissioned and the circumstances in which a Community Impact Assessment would be required as described in the appropriate Appendix. In general Councillor James stated that he welcomed the changes made to the Housing Policies and CER1.1, as referred to at the start of the Meeting, but stated that it was still his Group's view that a housing needs assessment should be carried out prior to a Housing Chapter being formulated. Councillor D LI Evans, the Leader of the Council, again stated that the level of homes required over the Plan period had been agreed in accordance with the professional advice given by the Officers which itself was based on a number of factors including sound projections. The Cabinet, he stated, were confident that the Policies being

presented today, which included the proposed changes agreed during the past few weeks, would enable the Council to provide the best possible opportunities for local people, especially young people to gain access to affordable housing within the current planning legislation.

- H1.4 —clarification provided on the word ‘ribboning’ in this policy.
- T3.1 – Priority Highway Improvement Schemes. Members proposed a change to the Reasons for Policy to reflect the need to emphasise the county-wide economic importance of the B4343/A4120 Tregaron to Ponterwyd route and to promote through the UDP the upgrading of this route.

The voting on the adoption of the proposed changes were as follows:

FOR: Councillors W G Bennett, J E Davies, W R Edwards, D Ll Evans, E J K Evans, T E Evans, E J Griffiths, S G Hopley, R P Quant, S H Richards, S M Thomas, J I Williams and A Wilson (13)

AGAINST: Councillors E E ap Gwynn and W P James (2)

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors E W Davies and H G Evans (2).

Resolution (i) below reflects this decision to agree the proposed changes to the policy chapters, subject to one further amendment.

Consideration was then given to the Reports of the Area Settlement Panels and the papers outlining the proposed changes. Members raised concerns on certain matters relating to Llanfarian, Site 149a/A Cardigan and Llanrhystud and resolution (iii) below reflects the decisions made on this matter.

It was RESOLVED:

- (i) to approve the proposed changes to the policy chapters of the Deposit Version of the Unitary Development Plan as detailed in the Report of the Director of Environmental Services and Housing and in the addendum to the Report, subject to the changes agreed to Policy T3.1 (Reasons) at Full Council, for further consultation and for presenting to the Inspector;
- (ii) to approve the minutes of the Area Panels, as being a correct record, as follows:
  - (a) Mid East (excluding Tregaron) – 26 November 2003
  - (b) North – 27 November 2003, subject to:
    - Noting that Councillor T A Thomas had apologised for his inability to attend the meeting
    - Including the sentence “To extend the boundary to include land on the north side of the Llancynfelyn Road” in the Tre’rddol and not the Tre Taliesin amendments and deleting the sentence “Update the Consultation Response Section of the settlement Statement” from the Tre Taliesin Amendments
    - Revert to officer recommendation to Area Settlement Panel on settlement boundary for Llanfarian, i.e., no change from Deposit Version of UDP.
  - (c) South – 1 December 2003, subject to:

- noting that Councillor T E Evans had disclosed a personal interest under Paragraph 11(a) of the Local Code of Conduct in respect of land at Llangoedmor and
  - that the dispensation granted to Councillor S M Morris referred to one piece of land only in Cardigan
  - No change to Deposit Version of Cardigan settlement boundary at Site 149/A.
- (d) Mid West – 1 December 2003, subject to:
- noting that Councillor C Llwyd had disclosed a personal interest under Paragraph 11(a) of the Local Code of Conduct in respect of land at Talgarreg
  - Inclusion of part of site 135/G as recommended by officers as a result of further discussions
- (e) Tregaron – 10 December 2003, subject to correcting the date in the title to read December.
- (iii) to approve the proposed changes to the settlement statements in the four areas as follows:
- Mid East
- North
- South
- Mid West
- (iv) to thank all the Officers involved for their work in presenting the information to Cabinet, Area panels and Council especially officers in the Forward Planning section and the Reprographics Unit.

**Confirmed at the Meeting to the Council held on 26 February 2004**

**CHAIRMAN:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 7

### List of Maps relating to Gwbert

#### Settlement Overview Map

Map 1 Identifies sites to which representations were received at either the Deposit stage or to the Proposed Changes document. The heavily black dotted area edged in green indicates Coastal Enhancement Area and is underlain by pale green indicating Special Landscape Area. Diagonal hatched areas are SSSI.

#### Detailed Maps:

Map 2 As Map 1, together with outstanding consents at 2001 (pink dots) and at 2004 (green dots on white ground).

Map 3 Illustrates Site 49/C indicated by Star and shows extent of site incorporating Seabank to Charlsbey.

Copies of these maps are available to view on the Inquiry website or at the Inquiry library at the Council offices in Penmorfa. Alternatively maps may be obtained upon request from the Policy and Forward Planning Team, please contact Mrs Catrin Cond. Copies of these maps will also be available on an overhead projector during any Inquiry sessions where this settlement is to be discussed. Please see the Inquiry Programme for scheduled dates.