

**Bridgend County Borough Council
Bridgend Local Development Plan Examination**

Schedule of Matters Arising Changes (MAC) [with Inspector's Comments (IC) in green]

Session 1 – Strategy

| MAC Reference | Location in LDP | Details of Change | Reason for Change |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| MAC1.1 (Action Point 1) | Para 1.1.1 | <p>Add the following text to paragraph 1.1.1</p> <p>The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires Bridgend County Borough Council (the Council) to prepare a Local Development Plan (LDP) setting out its objectives for the development and use of land in Bridgend County Borough over the plan period to 2021, and its policies to implement them. The Plan, <u>which should be read as a whole</u>, will be used by the Council to guide and manage development, providing a basis for consistent and appropriate decision-making.</p> | To add clarity to the plan. |
| | | IC1 - Agreed. | |
| MAC1.2 (Action Point 2) | New Para 1.7.9 | <p>Add new paragraph 1.7.9</p> <p><u>TAN20 requires local planning authorities to have regard to the needs and interests of the welsh language in preparing LDPs. The Council has concluded that given the relatively low levels of welsh language use across the County Borough, it is not considered that major development proposals will materially affect the linguistic balance of the area, to the detriment of welsh language use within its communities. This issue will therefore not be addressed by specific policies in the LDP. However, under the provisions of TAN20, the welsh language will remain a material consideration in the development management decision making process.</u></p> | To add clarity to the plan in terms of the provisions of TAN20. |
| | | IC2 - Agreed (NB should be 'Welsh' not 'welsh') | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| MAC1.3 (Action Point 3) | OBJ 3f | Amend Objective 3f to read: To support realistic and viable town and district centres in the County Borough which are attractive and economically successful. | To add clarity to the plan. |
| | | IC3 - Agreed | |
| MAC1.4 (Action Point 4) | Para 2.3.11 | Amend paragraph 2.3.11 to read: The level of development and growth has taken into account how much development would be required to have a significant regenerative effect, the availability of sites for development in that area, existing settlement patterns, having regard to the social and economic function and identity of settlements <u>and to relevant environmental considerations.</u> | To add clarity to the plan. |
| | | IC4 - Agreed | |
| MAC 1.5 | Appendix 3 | Amend the amount of vacant land on the following allocations as follows: SP9(1) Brocastle, Waterton Remaining Area (Ha): 46.10 <u>20.00</u> Medium Availability: 46.10 <u>20.00</u> Strategic Employment Site Total: 68.54 <u>42.44</u> REG1(6) Parc Afon Ewenni Remaining Area (Ha): 8.00 <u>2.00</u> Medium Availability: 8.00 <u>2.00</u> Bridgend SRGA Total: 40.93 <u>34.93</u> REG1(21) Land West of Maesteg Road, Tondu Remaining Area (Ha): 2.00 <u>2.70</u> Medium Availability: 2.00 <u>2.70</u> | To ensure the plan is up to date in terms of vacant employment land. |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------------------|
| | | <p>Valleys Gateway SRGA Total: 18.20 <u>18.90</u></p> <p>REG1(32) Isfryn Industrial Estate Remaining Area (Ha): 0.90 <u>0.40</u> Immediately Availability: 0.90 <u>0.40</u></p> <p>Other Sites Total: 15.49 <u>14.99</u></p> <p>County Borough Totals: Remaining Area: 152.50 <u>120.6</u> Immediately Availability: 40.90 <u>40.40</u> Medium Availability 91.30 <u>59.9</u></p> <p>The above changes will have consequential impacts on other areas of the Plan. However the Council will await Inspector's Preliminary Findings on employment and housing land need and supply before confirming the final changes needed in these areas.</p> | |
| | | IC5 – The vacant space figures will require further amendment if the allocations are modified at NE Brackla, Waterton, Island Farm, Ty Draw (N Cornelly/Pyle), and Coronation Works. | |
| MAC 1.6 (Action Point 5) | Policy REG1 | <p>Amend the opening paragraph of Policy REG2 to state:</p> <p>Land is allocated and protected for industrial and business <u>employment</u> development falling within the uses specified at:</p> | To add clarity to the Plan |
| | | IC6 – This should refer to Policy REG1, not REG2. | |
| MAC 1.7 (Action Point 5) | Policy REG2 | <p>Amend the opening paragraph of Policy REG2 to state:</p> <p>Proposals which result in the loss of existing or proposed industrial <u>employment (B1, B2 and B8)</u> land or buildings on sites identified in Policy REG1 will not be permitted. Exceptions will need to be justified on one of the following grounds:</p> | To add clarity to the Plan |
| | | IC7 – Should REG2(2) also be modified to refer to employment land | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| | | rather than industrial land? | |
| MAC 1.8 (Action Point 5) | Policy REG3 | <p>Amend the opening paragraph of Policy REG3 to state:</p> <p>Proposals which result in the change of use of existing industrial employment (B1, B2 and B8) buildings to uses within Class D2 of the Use Classes Order on Policy REG1 sites will be permitted provided that:</p> | To add clarity to the Plan |
| | | IC8 - Agreed | |

**Action Point 6: Agenda Item No. Qn2f(x)
Note from BCBC to Inspector – Consideration of B1 Uses and the Sequential Test**

The Council wishes to encourage all forms of sustainable economic development in the County Borough and, whilst acknowledging the preference in 10.2.9. of Planning Policy Wales for office of central and local government and commercial offices to be located in town centres, it would not wish to be overly prescriptive on this issue to the detriment of the wider economy, the needs of the market and a preference to develop identified sites in Bridgend Town Centre in particular for new retail development.

Policies SP9 and REG1 of the deposit LDP identifies that all of the sites allocated for employment uses in the plan are suitable for B1 uses. However, it is the Council’s opinion that, for the most part, the development of B1 uses in the majority of these sites will be for the ‘light industry’ category of uses within this class rather than purpose built office developments. Given the nature and environment of many of the REG1 sites, the Council believes the development of B1 offices will be self-limiting to those developments required for the expansion of existing firms who may need to grow their administrative functions, rather than for new speculative office development.

The other self-limiting factor is the market itself. Evidence from the Bridgend Employment Land Review points to an attractiveness to Bridgend town and its environs only for new office development, and certainly no wider than the M4 corridor. This is due to the good connections which these areas give to the business community and is exemplified by recent office developments at Bocam Park and Waterton Industrial Estate. However, commentary contained within the Employment Land Review points to a view that the market itself for this type of development in Bridgend is limited.

Notwithstanding this, the Council has widely expressed its support for its town centres throughout the plan and the Hearing Sessions which have taken place to date. The Bridgend Town Centre Masterplan, whilst primarily focusing on retail development, does identify several sites which could be suitable for office development. Additional, albeit limited, opportunities also exist for offices above new retail development as well as the refurbishment and enhancement of existing buildings for this purpose.

To this end, the Council would propose the LDP reflects a similar position to the adopted Bridgend Unitary Development which was equally flexible on this matter in the context of similar national policy. However the UDP did include a specific policy on office development in town centres.

Therefore, to further align the plans the Council considers that the following Matters Arising Changes would add further clarity to the LDP in this respect.

| MAC Reference | Location in LDP | Details of Change |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| MAC1.12 (Action Point 6) | New Para after 5.1.9 | <p>New Paragraph After 5.1.9:</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that B1 office uses are best located within the town centres of the County Borough; however the REG1 sites also</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | provide opportunities for office development on sites across the County Borough. These opportunities should be viewed in the context of the need to undertake a sequential test of sites, as required by national policy and Policy SP10 of the LDP. |
| | | IC9 – This should not refer only to the REG1 sites as Policy SP9 also describes the SP9 sites as suitable for B1 including eg financial and professional services (i.e. offices). In many cases the SP9 sites are likely to be more attractive to office uses than are many of the REG1 sites. |
| MAC 1.13 (Action Point 6) | Policy SP10 | <p>Amend Policy SP10 as follows:</p> <p>New retail, office, other commercial, leisure and appropriate employment developments will be focused according to the following hierarchy of retailing and commercial centres within Bridgend County Borough;</p> <p>.....</p> <p>New retail, office, other commercial and leisure developments shall be of a scale appropriate to the centre within which they are located, and should contribute to or sustain the vitality and attractiveness of that centre within the local retail hierarchy.</p> <p>New out-of-centre retail and office development should be developed as a result of an identified need and sequential test of sites and should not be of a scale and type which would adversely affect the vitality, viability and attractiveness of the retailing and commercial centres.</p> |
| | | <p>IC10</p> <p><i>Sequential Approach</i></p> <p>The proposed changes to Policy SP10 and the glossary definition of commercial use (below) would clear up the current uncertainty by clearly defining offices as commercial uses that should preferably be located according to the retail and commercial hierarchy using the sequential approach advocated by PPW5.</p> <p>However PPW5 paragraph 10.2.11 provides for the sequential approach to be applied <u>before</u> sites for offices and other town centre uses are selected in development plans, rather than afterwards. It is not evident that this has been done and the LDP currently provides that <u>any</u> allocated employment site could be considered for office development. Ideally there should be a process to identify in the LDP which of the employment sites are sequentially preferable for office development. However to do so now would delay the Plan and the alternative approach now proposed by the Council would require the application of the sequential approach at the planning application stage.</p> |

For the REG1 and SP9 employment sites the submitted LDP would currently allow that any allocated site may include B1 offices. That is without any consideration of their scale or their impact on centres in the retail and commercial hierarchy or any accessibility considerations. However these sites are much more extensive than the allocated retail sites and could accommodate all scales of development with potential for intensively occupied and visited office developments with high reliance on access by car and the non-implementation of opportunities for office development in locations where it would support town centres. There is no evidence that the sequential approach has been applied in identifying those sites, many of which are long-standing employment commitments. In these circumstances the application of a sequential approach at the development management stage, as proposed, would provide a necessary long-stop to direct office development to the more sustainable locations.

However whilst Policy SP10 as proposed to be amended would ostensibly apply the same sequential approach to office and retail development, there is some variation in how the amended LDP would apply the sequential approach to sites that are included in retail and employment allocations.

For retail development, Policy REG10 would apply the sequential approach to floorspace additions at identified existing out of centre retail sites, whilst seeking a preferential status for these sites over unallocated out of centre sites. This may be justified on the basis of the sites' good accessibility and the opportunity for combined shopping trips to several premises. As these out of centre sites are already substantially developed the opportunities for further floorspace within their boundaries are likely to be physically limited. That would moderate the impacts on the existing retail and commercial centres.

Policy REG11 allocates new out of centre (or edge of centre) sites for bulky goods retail development. However, in accordance with PPW5 paragraph 10.3.1 the LDP would not require the use of a sequential approach at the development management stage. It may be inferred that these sites have already been identified as suitable in terms of the sequential approach prior to their allocation. Also it is now proposed following Session 7 that defined floorspace amounts be applied to each of the REG11 sites. The appropriate amount of such development has been considered in the retail studies.

To suggested approach to office development would more closely reflect that for the REG10 retail sites rather than that for the REG11 retail sites. However the potential scale and impact could be very different according to scale and location. The accessibility of the different employment sites by non car modes varies significantly with some close to railway stations or frequent bus routes and accessible by cycle or on foot and others less well connected.

PPW5 Targets for office and industry/warehousing

An important consideration is that paragraph 7.5.1 of PPW5 (Nov 2012) contains a new provision that development plans should, amongst other things, provide targets on land provision for the employment uses (Classes B1-B8) showing net change in land/floorspace for offices and industry/warehousing separately and to protect those sites from inappropriate development. This separation of B1 offices from other B1 uses is complicated by their inclusion within the same B1 use class. That would normally allow changes of use within the same class without the need for a planning application.

Whilst many of the priority sectors for economic development (identified by the Welsh Government in Document SD121 and reflected in LDP paragraph 5.1.5) could be accommodated in B1 premises and would be compatible neighbours on the same site, only some occupiers would require B1(a) offices whereas others would require other B1(b) or B1(c) accommodation suitable for light industry or for research and development.

At present the submitted LDP only provides figures for all vacant employment land. It does not provide separate figures for available land or floorspace for offices or for industry/warehousing. Neither is there an overall target for the provision of office land or floorspace as now sought by PPW5. However whilst the Employment Land Review identified that a significant proportion of enquiries from firms seeking employment space concerns office provision, I have seen no information in the current evidence base that could support specific separate targets for either office space or industrial/storage space. Ideally research would be commissioned to establish appropriate targets. However this would cause inevitable delays at this late stage of the examination process. The lack of a target or overall needs assessment could present difficulties in applying the sequential approach at the development management stage if need had to be demonstrated by the applicant.

However it would not be necessary to demonstrate need for office development in town centres and PPW5 paragraph 10.3.1 provides that the need for development elsewhere for uses best located in a town centre does not have to be taken into account if the proposal is for a site allocated in an up-to-date development plan. There would thus be no requirement to demonstrate the need for office development on an allocated employment site. However the application of the sequential approach could still be justified (as in the case of the REG10 retail sites) and particularly having regard to the potential scale and impact of some sites and the numbers who could be employed in intensive multi-floor developments and the associated effect on movement patterns.

If the sequential approach is applied, then having established that there was no suitable or available site in, or on the edge of, the town there or in district and local centres, consideration could be given to out of centre

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | sites. However the suggested LDP changes do not expressly prioritise either the allocated employment sites or those sites that are accessible by a choice of means of transport (PPW5 paragraph 10.2.11). |
| MAC 1.14 (Action Point 6) | New Para After 5.2.8 | <p>Insert new paragraph after 5.2.8:</p> <p>Office developments also add to the diversity of uses in town centres and they can attract large numbers of the general public into those centres. In addition, they can help to diversify the employment profile in an area and help create jobs. The Government's objective of sustaining and enhancing the vitality, attractiveness and viability of town centres is complemented by advice to encourage the diversification of uses within the town centre as a whole. This is recognition of the fact that as well as ensuring a wide variety and range of shops, the vitality of shopping centres is also dependent on its ability to draw investment from other sectors of the economy. The County Borough's town centres are well served by a choice of public transport, locating employment generating uses within town centres will contribute to the overall objective of sustainability, by maximising the opportunities for employees as well as shoppers, to use means of transport other than the car.</p> |
| | | <p>IC11 – Agreed as useful supporting text to explain the role of offices in town centres. However economic sectors requiring office accommodation are identified for growth and only a proportion of that office development is likely to be capable of being accommodated on the limited sites available within the defined town centres. Additional text is therefore needed to explain the application of the sequential approach to office development elsewhere. A suggested sequence would be along the following lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre • Edge of town centre • District/local centres • SP9 strategic employment sites which support the Plan's strategy and provide for the priority employment sectors that require office accommodation • REG1 employment sites which provide a suitable environment for office development and that are highly accessible by a choice of means of travel • Other REG1 employment sites which provide a suitable environment for office development • Unallocated sites within settlement boundaries |
| MAC 1.15 (Action Point 6) | Policy REG9 | <p>The opening paragraph of Policy REG9 to be amended as follows:</p> <p>The regeneration of retail and commercial centres through the refurbishment or redevelopment of key sites and buildings for retail, office, other commercial, leisure and complementary uses (falling within</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | A1, A2, A3, D1 and D2) will be favoured. The following sites are identified as key sites: |
| | | IC12 - Agreed |
| MAC 1.16 (Action Point 7) | Glossary | <p>Add new word and definition to glossary</p> <p>Commercial Development</p> <p>Development used for commercial purposes which includes B1 and A2 office uses, retail floorspace (not necessarily covered by use class A1) and A3 uses (including public houses, restaurants, takeaways etc.)</p> |
| | | IC13 - Agreed |

**Action Point 9: Agenda Item No. Qn2j
 Table 3.1 and LDP Monitoring**

The Council has been invited to consider how the LDP site database could be used to monitor the information contained in Table 3.1 of the plan.

This issue will be considered by the Council and further information will be contained in the Council's Statement to Session 14 of the examination.

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| <p>MAC 1.9 (Action Point 8)</p> | <p>Proposals Map</p> | <p>Add the boundaries of the SRGAs to the Proposals Map. See Appendix A for Proposed Boundaries</p> <p>The boundaries of the Porthcawl, Valleys Gateway and Maesteg and Llynfi Valley SRGAs are coincidental with the settlement boundaries of those areas in their entirety.</p> <p>For Bridgend it is coincidental with the settlement boundary between points A and B identified on the plan along the town's eastern edge. The western part of the boundary is newly identified for the purposes of the Proposals Map, but is reflective of the sites identified under policies REG1, COM1 and COM2 in respect of their location within or outside an SRGA.</p> | <p>To show the spatial expression of Policy SP1 on the Proposals Map, to add clarity to the Plan.</p> |
| | | <p>IC14 - Agreed</p> | |
| <p>MAC1.10 (Action Point 10)</p> | <p>Para 3.1.5</p> | <p>Amend paragraph 3.1.5 as follows:</p> <p>In order to focus development in areas where the maximum social, economic and environmental benefits can be achieved, Policy PLA1 makes a distinction between the settlements of the County Borough.</p> <p>Although the SRGAs will be the main focus of planned development, it is acknowledged that the settlements detailed in Policy PLA1 will also provide opportunities for development within their respective settlement boundaries. The identified settlements will continue to be the location of future planned development, the scale and type of which will reflect their individual role and function. The settlement hierarchy is based on the conclusions of the Bridgend County Borough Settlement Role and Function Study (2009).</p> | <p>To clarify the relationship between policies SP1 and PLA1 and agreed at Hearing Session 2.</p> |
| | | <p>IC15 - Agreed</p> | |
| <p>MAC1.11 (Action Point 11)</p> | <p>Policy PLA2</p> | <p>Amend the text of Policy PLA2 to read:</p> <p>Development likely to have an unacceptable or detrimental unacceptably detrimental impact on the implementation of a</p> | <p>To clarify the intentions of the policy.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | regeneration strategy/programme will not be permitted. | |
| | | IC16 - Agreed | |

Appendix A