

Meeting of:	<b>Council</b>
Date of Meeting:	<b>Monday, 30 September 2024</b>
Relevant Scrutiny Committee:	Environment and Regeneration
Report Title:	Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) 2021-2036 Preferred Strategy Initial Consultation Report – Supplementary Report
Purpose of Report:	To provide supplementary information in respect of the Preferred Strategy Initial Consultation Report.
Report Owner:	Marcus Goldsworthy, Director of Place
Responsible Officer:	Victoria Morgan, Principal Planner
Elected Member and Officer Consultation:	
Policy Framework:	This report provides supplementary information in respect of a report that has been previously been referred to Full Council for approval following consideration at Cabinet and Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.
Executive Summary:	<p>Since consideration of the RLDP Preferred Strategy Initial Consultation Report by Cabinet on 11th July 2024 and Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee on 16th July 2024, officers have become aware that due to an IT issue, two email submissions submitted by an individual representor were not included within the Initial Consultation Report. The representor has evidenced that they were sent within the consultation period, and it has been agreed that they were duly made. This supplementary report considers these submissions.</p>

## **Recommendations**

1. That the supplementary information provided in this report be endorsed as an update to the agenda item on the Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) 2021-2036 Preferred Strategy Initial Consultation Report.
2. That an additional recommendation be included for delegated authority to be granted to the Director of Place and the Head of Sustainable Development to make any further typographical or other minor amendments to the Initial Consultation Report.

## **Reasons for Recommendations**

1. To provide Full Council with the most up to date information on the Preferred Strategy consultation responses.
2. To make typographical or minor changes as necessary without the need to seek Cabinet or full Council approval.

## **1. Background**

- 1.1 Since consideration of the RLDP Preferred Strategy Initial Consultation Report (ICR) by Cabinet on 11th July 2024 and Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee on 16th July 2024, officers have become aware that due to an IT issue, two email submissions submitted by an individual representor were not included within the ICR. The representor has evidenced that they were sent within the consultation period, and it has been agreed that they were duly made. The submissions included representations on elements of the Preferred Strategy, and support for a candidate site submitted as part of the initial call for candidate sites.

## **2. Key Issues for Consideration**

- 2.1 The first email submission relates to the Preferred Strategy, with concerns being raised in respect of the strategy options, the key elements of the Preferred Strategy and the strategic policies that support this. The representation expresses concerns that the Strategy focuses on rail rather than places with good bus services and cycling opportunities, such as along the A48/St Nicholas. It also notes the need to retain and support the important functional role of minor rural settlements in order to deliver a balanced population. The representation also raises concerns about the affordable housing led approach in minor rural settlements and the maximum site size of 25 dwellings.
- 2.2 As many representors raised similar issues as part of the consultation, the ICR groups together key issues rather than responding to individual representations. A number of the comments raised are matters that have also

been raised by other representors and as such have been addressed within the ICR. However, for completeness, Appendix 1 summarises the comments and cross references this to relevant sections of the ICR.

- 2.3 In addition, the representations also cover some additional points, for which a response is included in Appendix 1.
- 2.4 The second email submission is in support of candidate site 374, Land at the Court, St Nicholas. For completeness, this site should be included within the schedule of sites upon which representations have been made in Annex 8 of the ICR. It should be noted that the ICR does not give detailed responses in respect of submissions made on candidate sites, but the additional evidence submitted will be considered as part of the ongoing assessment of candidate sites. The outcome of this assessment process for all candidate sites will be published as part of the evidence base for the Deposit Plan.
- 2.5 The inclusion of these new representations will slightly increase the totals for the number of representations received. The number of duly made representations on the Preferred Strategy will increase to 2,859 with 2,209 objections and the number of representations on the candidate site register will increase to 313, with 73 representations of support. There will be consequential changes to other figures in the ICR as a result. It is requested that an additional recommendation be included for delegated authority to be granted to the Director of Place and the Head of Sustainable Development to make any further typographical or other minor amendments to the Initial Consultation Report to allow these consequential amendments to be made.

### **3 How do proposals evidence the Five Ways of Working and contribute to our Well-being Objectives?**

- 3.1 No updates to the published report.

### **4 Climate Change and Nature Implications**

- 4.1 No updates to the published report.

### **5 Resources and Legal Considerations**

#### **Financial**

- 5.1 No updates to the published report

#### **Employment**

- 5.2 No updates to the published report.

### **Legal (Including Equalities)**

**5.3** No updates to the published report

### **6 Background Papers**

None.

**Appendix 1 – Additional representations on the Preferred Strategy and Candidate Site Register for inclusion in the Initial Consultation Report**

**Preferred Strategy**

<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>Council response</b>	<b>Action</b>
Option 4 is too narrow in directing development to settlements served by rail stations. Other settlements with good bus services and cycling opportunities should be considered as 'well served' by public transport.	<p>This is addressed on page A2-43 of the ICR:</p> <p>Whilst buses do make an important contribution towards the delivery of the strategy, bus services alone cannot deliver the frequency and capacity of public transport that the rail network can deliver.</p> <p>In defining the strategic growth area, consideration is not only given to the availability of sustainable modes of transport, but also considers whether employment, services and facilities are available to reduce the need to travel in the first place.</p>	N/A
There is insufficient previously developed land to meet housing need, including for affordable housing.	The Preferred Strategy recognises that there is insufficient previously developed land to meet housing need, and therefore identifies a strategy which does allow for the development of appropriate greenfield sites in sustainable locations. Affordable housing led sites would also be acceptable in principle on appropriate greenfield sites.	N/A
The Preferred Strategy is contradictory to the current strategy.	<p>This is addressed on page A2-28 of the ICR:</p> <p>The fact that the UDP and adopted LDP allowed for growth in Minor Rural Settlements does not mean such a strategy continues to remain appropriate, particularly in light of significant changes to national planning and transport policy.</p>	N/A
The Preferred Strategy should recognise the importance of the A48 transport corridor.	<p>This is addressed on page A2-27 of the ICR:</p> <p>Cowbridge is located on the A48 and has been included within the Strategic Growth Area and has two rolled forward sites identified. The other</p>	N/A

	settlements on or close to the A48 are Minor Rural Settlements where new development would be limited to small scale affordable housing led development if appropriate given the relatively lower sustainability scoring.	
Not all journeys can or will be made by rail or non-car modes so the A48 settlements are a sustainable location for development.	<p>This is addressed on page A2-6 of the ICR:</p> <p>It is recognised that for some people and some journeys, utilising modes other than the car will not be possible. However, the RLDP promotes sites that will give people options by developing in the right places to create a critical mass to support public transport and active travel. These developments will also contribute towards sustainable transport through Section 106 improvements within the local area.</p>	N/A
<p>Growth should be prioritised in suitable Minor Rural Settlements such as St Nicholas which represents a suitable location to Cardiff which is inherently well connected by the existing road networks and other modes of public transport.</p> <p>Minor rural settlements have an important functional role and need to be retained and supported.</p>	<p>The response on page A2-61/62 should be expanded to include the following:</p> <p>The Strategy focuses growth in the areas that are most sustainable in terms of both sustainable transport and the availability of employment, services and facilities. Outside of the strategic growth area, small scale affordable housing led development proportionate to the scale of the settlement will be allocated within Minor Rural Settlements if appropriate sites are available, together with re-use of existing buildings and infill opportunities.</p>	N/A
Need for population balance to offset the ageing population through the provision of appropriate housing.	<p>Many of the defined settlements in the Vale have accommodated new housing development in recent years as adopted LDP allocated sites have been delivered. This has included a range of housing types to encourage a population balance.</p> <p>Small scale affordable housing led development proportionate to the scale of the settlement will be allocated within Minor Rural Settlements if appropriate sites are available, together with re-use of existing buildings and infill opportunities. This will assist in providing a range of housing types, including affordable homes, for a wide demographic.</p>	N/A

Small scale affordable housing should be permitted outside of settlement boundaries in addition to specific allocations.	The Deposit RLDP will include a policy allowing for the delivery of affordable housing on exceptions sites on appropriate sites outside the settlement boundary but with a distinct relationship to the settlement where there is evidence of need and where the site is proportionate to the settlement.	N/A
The limit of 25 dwellings for small scale affordable housing led development is arbitrary and unnecessary and there is a need for greater flexibility.	Policy SP2 specifies that the threshold for affordable housing led sites is up to 25 dwellings in minor rural settlements and up to 50 dwellings in primary settlements. It is considered necessary to provide a threshold to ensure that the size of affordable housing led sites that are coming forward are proportionate to the size of the settlements that they are serving, and the 25 or 50 dwelling thresholds are viewed to represent an appropriate scale. This number shouldn't be seen as a target and the supporting text specifies "proposals should be led by Placemaking principles set out in Policy SP5, rather than by a desire to maximise the number of dwellings set out in the policy."	N/A
Clarification is needed as to why affordable housing led schemes in minor rural settlements may be supported, but not market residential schemes when the physical impact and social support needs are the same.	The proportion of affordable housing led schemes is in direct response to the acute need for affordable housing that exists across the Vale, including within the minor rural settlements. From this perspective, the provision of higher levels of affordable housing will have a greater social impact for those Vale residents in need of affordable housing than would be the case in an open market led development. It should be noted that affordable housing led schemes will only be allocated on sites where the physical impact is deemed to be acceptable.	N/A

### Candidate Site Register

1 representation of support received on site 374 Land at the Court, St Nicholas.