



**RTPI Cymru**  
Royal Town Planning Institute  
Sefydliad Cynllunio Trefol Brenhinol

Royal Town Planning Institute  
Cymru (RTPI Cymru)  
PO Box 2465  
Cardiff  
CF23 0DS  
Tel +44 (0)29 2047 3923  
email [walespolicy@rtpi.org.uk](mailto:walespolicy@rtpi.org.uk)  
Website: [www.rtpi.org.uk/rtpi\\_cymru](http://www.rtpi.org.uk/rtpi_cymru)

18<sup>th</sup> May 2018

e-mail response sent to: [planconsultations-c@gov.wales](mailto:planconsultations-c@gov.wales)

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Response to: Planning Policy Wales: Edition 10**

The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) is the largest professional institute for planners in Europe, representing some 25,000 spatial planners. RTPI Cymru represents the RTPI in Wales, with 1,100 members. The Institute seeks to advance the science and art of spatial planning for the benefit of the public. As well as promoting spatial planning, the RTPI develops and shapes policy affecting the built environment, works to raise professional standards and supports members through continuous education, training and development.

The response has been formed drawing on the expertise of the RTPI Cymru Policy and Research Forum, which includes a cross section of planning practitioners from the private and public sectors and academia from across Wales.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute our views to the above consultation. We welcome this consultation on Draft Planning Policy Wales (PPW) (edition 10). PPW is the cornerstone of national planning policy for Wales and we support the principle of aligning it with the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act, to keep it current and at the forefront of delivering quality places.

RTPI Cymru's response to the consultation questions are set out below in the form. In addition, we have also provided some general comments on specific areas and subjects within the document.

If you require further assistance, please contact RTPI Cymru on 029 2047 3923 or e-mail Roisin Willmott at [walespolicy@rtpi.org.uk](mailto:walespolicy@rtpi.org.uk)

Yours sincerely,

Dr Roisin Willmott OBE FRTPi  
**Director**  
**RTPI Cymru**

<b>Q1</b>	Do you agree planning policy topics be clustered around themes which show their relationships with each other and the 7 well-being goals? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

#### **Further comments**

We welcome the move to align PPW with the Well-being Act and goals. The new format is a step change in how policy is presented and it will take time for users to shift to new ways of using policy but we welcome the move to place making that it brings. It is important that PPW does not lose its focus.

Connections exist not only between topics within the four themes (Placemaking, Active and Social Places, Productive and Enterprising Places, Distinctive and Natural Places) but also between policies across all the groups. As with previous layouts the important thing is to ensure all policy guidance and linkages are concisely and clearly set out. The change in format of PPW means that where a particular issue is found in a number of places then it requires very effective cross referencing by the user.

We have noted some lack of consistency throughout the document for example TANs are referred to in some places as planning policy and other places as guidance. We suggest that more clarity is required with the uses of words like principle and goals etc. These words are familiar to professionals and have been used in different ways throughout the document. For example, there are many principles/aims/goals etc set out in the introductory section including 7 National Well Being Goals, 5 Ways of Working, 5 Key Planning Principles, 22 National Place Making Outcomes, 4 Sustainable Places and Well-being themes, 20 different 'considerations of development', 4 different themes and 5 key aspects of good design. It is vital that terms and language are clear to avoid confusion.

<b>Q2</b>	Do you agree the introduction provides an adequate overview of the planning system in Wales and appropriate context? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

#### **Further comments**

All stakeholders, including practitioners, Councillors, community groups and the public generally should find it a useful resource and so it is important that the introduction, in particular, can be understood be all.

The Well-being Act five ways of working icons are not familiar to all and it would be helpful to clarify in paragraph 2.6 the icons are from the Act. However, allocating a symbol to

specific parts of the document may be misleading and we would suggest that the five are integral throughout the planning process.

Chapter 2 sets out to explain the concept of placemaking in the context of both plan-making and development management decisions. This section of the document necessarily covers the administrative machinery involved. However, we think this section could include a stronger focus on people. It would also greatly benefit from beginning with a clear explanation and definition of what place-making means in the context of the Well Being of Future Generations Act and PPW.

Some of the introductory sections are overly simplistic. As an example, paragraph 2.54 states, "Where greenfield sites are necessary, the value of agricultural land will need to be taken into account". This suggests that it is only the value of the agricultural land that is to be taken into account, or this may take priority, whereas there may be many other important considerations which could be relevant in any particular case.

Paragraphs 1.33 and 1.34 should be made clear that Place Plans have to be in general conformity with the relevant Local Development Plan (LDP). The final sentence at paragraph 1.33 should be expanded to make it clear that Place Plans will need to be approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in order to be material in the determination of planning proposals.

Paragraphs 1.39 and 1.40 discuss Welsh Government call-in of applications and states that "such intervention would overturn an LPA's judgement on a matter" and "that such action should be considered only where the original decision is judged to be grossly wrong". This is confusing, firstly, a call-in does not necessarily overturn a LPA's judgement on a matter. Welsh Ministers may reach the same conclusion and refuse / permit the application in line with the LPA's recommendation. Secondly, a 'decision' cannot have technically been made on an application at the point it is called in. It would either be called in before the LPA has had an opportunity to consider it, or immediately after a resolution to refuse/permit by the LPA's Planning Committee (either way prior to a formal 'decision'). Clarification is needed on the wording of these paragraphs to ensure it is procedurally correct.

We note the wording at paragraph 1.16 is different from the duty set out in s38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This could cause confusion. We would suggest that the wording in the draft PPW be reviewed to ensure that it is consistent with the statutory duty.

We have a number of concerns with paragraph 1.32:

The description of an LDP is overly simplistic and suggests a significant change in policy. LDPs are more than just site allocation documents.

The sentence that starts "Preparation should be on a footprint ..." is unclear and should be clarified.

The case made for joint LDPs is unconvincing. We would suggest that the sentence referring to the preparation of Joint LDPs needs amending to require LPAs to strongly consider preparation of Joint LDPs and provide evidence and explanation to the decision made. It would be helpful to provide criteria to guide LPAs on this process.

At paragraph 2.26 – We recommend the addition of "Flood Risk Management" to the list of specialist officers in the first sentence.

At paragraph 2.32 – "Flood risk management" should be added to the list of benefits from green infrastructure.

We welcome the concept of the positive protection and enhancement of green infrastructure, and welcome the recognition of its importance in creating sustainable

places. However, there is a strong case for this definition to be widened to include the aquatic environment, and using the term blue/green Infrastructure. This would enable it to reflect the wider value of all bodies of water as an integral element in the design process for new development, and also the role of water bodies in biodiversity, improving air quality and managing water, both in terms of supply and flood risk. This approach should encompass all water whether natural or man-made, including rivers, estuaries, lakes, reservoirs and canals. This approach should be reflected throughout the document where green infrastructure is mentioned.

Paragraph 2.45 should include a reference to green infrastructure also accommodating Sustainable Drainage.

At paragraph 2.54, the fourth sentence should be expanded to include a reference to “wider environmental benefits”.

The document currently omits any recognition to the existence of some brownfield sites in the open countryside. This is not noted in paragraph 2.54 nor in paragraphs 2.81 to 2.84 on rural areas.

The environmental considerations listed as key factors in decision-making (paragraph 2.25) are welcomed, but there appears to be a key omission given the absence of the impact on the landscape as one of the key factors.

<b>Q3</b>	Do you agree with the Planning Principles? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>We support the Planning Principles.</p> <p>We note that the commentary on the principles do not mention a plan led system, which would be useful under Principle 1. We would also recommend recognition of the linguistic needs of communities.</p> <p>The principles risk being lost within the document amongst all the other themes and outcomes and therefore could lose impact.</p>		

<b>Q4</b>	Do you agree with the definition of what is a ‘Sustainable Place’? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

The diagram assists as an illustration of the variety of factors that should be considered. However, an explanation of whether all elements are required to be considered or whether they are aspirational would provide clarity. Some of the statements in the diagram require action beyond what planning can achieve and risk raising expectations.

We note that ‘manages and mitigates flood risk’ is an important element not included in the diagram. The criterion ‘responds to climate change’ could be strengthened, by using the terminology at paragraph 2.81 in relation to rural areas - “resilient to the impacts of climate change, and plays a role in reducing its causes”.

We would also suggest adding reference to the Welsh language, for example – “supports the use of the Welsh language.”

As far as possible, they should be expressed as tangible attributes of the sustainable places we want to see. Planners must seek to achieve these characteristics when formulating development plan policies, strategies and development proposals and, in appraising development proposals through the development management process, they should be able to assess the extent to which schemes reflect the characteristics of sustainable places. For these reasons, we recommend they be reviewed and they are located within the text of the main document as well. This will ensure they can be referred to for the purposes of policy development and decision-making.

<b>Q5</b>	Do you agree with high-level planning outcomes highlighted by People and Places: The National Placemaking Outcomes? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

We support the high-level planning outcomes. However it is unclear how the outcomes are intended to be used. If they are as an assessment tool they need to be strengthened, with less duplication across outcomes. Many are very high level, which would make measurement very subjective and potentially meaningless. Many of these outcomes could not be measured prior to development taking place and are out of the realms of what planning can achieve. If it was a requirement to consider the whole suite of outcomes at planning application stage it would put an onerous and lengthy delay on the development application process and LDP process.

It would be helpful to explain how the National Placemaking Outcomes link to the five Key Planning Principles.

The term place making and its outcomes are used throughout the document, but there is no clear, succinct explanation of what it means, only what it can achieve. While there are graphics, in this case a written description is considered more appropriate.

<b>Q6</b>	Do you agree with the search sequence outlined for the formulation of development plan strategies? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>We support the proposed search sequence to be used in the preparation of development plans. However there should also be a recognition that there may be some exceptional planning proposals where the particular requirements of the scheme will mean that the general search approach is not appropriate. In such cases the exceptional requirements and reasons for the proposed location should be made clear by LPAs. It should also be clarified that cross boundary proposals should emerge from a co-operative approach by adjacent local authorities.</p> <p>We note this section appears to have implications for the NDF, in terms of strategy and larger project decisions.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.54 requires a caveat stating that not all brownfield sites will be appropriate. However, we note this is mentioned at paragraph 2.66. Consistency is needed across all caveats.</p>		

<b>Q7</b>	Do you agree with our revised policy approach for the promotion of new settlements and urban extensions If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>We assume this would also apply to 1,000+ dwellings in one settlement spread over more than one site (e.g. 2 sites of 500+ dwellings)? This could be argued to have similar cumulative impacts of a strategic nature.</p> <p>Whilst collaboration across local authority areas is important, it should be considered in the context of both the scale of the development, its location in relation to neighbouring authorities and what collaborative structures already exist. Specifying that these proposals must be brought forward as joint LDPs, SDPs or within the NDP may well be unnecessary where good local structures for collaboration already exist.</p> <p>Whilst it is possible / essential to provide a range of services and employment appropriate to the size of the proposed new settlement is it unrealistic to assume the settlements will be 'self contained'? We would recommend a minimum service provision and guidance in a TAN may be useful. See our comments on active travel at question 18 and 19.</p>		

<b>Q8</b>	Do you agree with our revised policy approach to the preference for the re-use of previously developed land? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

We support the revised approach to the preference of previously developed land. This is in accordance with good planning practice and the efficient use of scarce land resources. However, we question the reality of local authorities becoming more proactively involved in the purchase (paragraph 2.65) of previously developed land in the context of local authority budgets and Brexit. We believe that local authorities need to be working in more creative ways to enable this to happen.

<b>Q9</b>	Do you agree with our revised policy approach for the designation of Green Belts and Green Wedges? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

We broadly support the revised policy approach for green wedges and green belts, however strengthening emphasis on full collaboration with neighbouring authorities could be another approach.

We would suggest that while green belts should only 'normally' be proposed by a joint LDP or an SDP there should be an option of proposing one in a single LDP where strong argument for it can be produced or where it is also supported by adjoining local authorities in exceptional circumstances which would need to be defined.

<b>Q10</b>	Do you agree with the issues and inter-linkages highlighted in the introduction to the Active and Social Places chapter? What other issues and linkages could be identified to support this theme?	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>

<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>	
We note that much of the introduction of this chapter may appear repetitive, but this may assist in emphasising the Planning Principles etc. in the context of Active and Social Places.	

<b>Q11</b>	Do you agree that it is important for viability to be assessed at the outset of the plan preparation process and for this to be supported by an enhanced role for housing trajectories? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
The link between viability and deliverability needs to be explicit. Although we acknowledge that there will be a time gap from LDP preparation and contexts may change. However elements, particularly in terms of site conditions should be assessed. We would recommend that build rates need to be realistic so that development plans are focused around delivery.		

<b>Q12</b>	Do you agree that it is important for a flexibility allowance to be included as a policy requirement in order to facilitate the delivery of planned housing requirements? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
Clear advice is needed within the TAN as to how that figure is to be calculated by local authorities to reflect their own circumstances. For example, a local authority seeing high economic and employment growth could need a higher allowance.		



<b>Q13</b>	Do you agree that to deliver the new housing Wales needs it is necessary for local planning authorities to allocate a range of site sizes, including small sites, to provide opportunities for all types of house builder to contribute to the delivery of the proposed housing? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
Yes, RTPI Cymru supports the need to enable a range of sites and providers to assist in the delivery of housing. There needs to be consideration on how to optimise housing delivery across a range of sites and capacity across various options, such as redevelopment or infill on underused/vacant commercial/infrastructure sites.		

<b>Q14</b>	To ensure that small sites are allocated, should there be a requirement for a specific percentage (e.g. 20%) of sites to be small sites? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
RTPI Cymru supports the policy proposal for 20% housing provided on smaller sites as a means of producing a greater range of housing innovations and designs to cope with the varied housing needs in communities but will need to be evidenced. A criteria for the definition of 'smaller sites' will also be required. However we are unable to locate where the 20% requirement is explicitly referenced in the document.		

<b>Q15</b>	Do you agree that the custom and self-build sector can play an important role in housing delivery, in particular when linked to the use of Local Development Orders and design codes? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>

<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>	
<p>New ways of delivering housing need to be considered and custom / self build is an important growth sector. Whilst, not wishing to stifle innovation in delivery it is important that a LDO or a Design Code is established for a development site that sets consensus on design quality and standards influenced by policies in the development plan.</p>	

<b>Q16</b>	Do you agree that negotiating on an 'open book' basis would help to improve trust between the parties and facilitate the delivery of both market and affordable housing? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>The principle of an 'open book' approach would be helpful. Any evidence used must then follow through into any further negotiations post-decision or at appeal stage.</p>		

<b>Q17</b>	Do you agree with the changes to emphasise the need for the appropriate provision of community facilities when considering development proposal? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>We feel that the reference to community facilities throughout the document could be stronger. This is essential when talking about sustainable places.</p> <p>However, there needs to be a distinction between 'nice to have' community facilities and those which are a minimum requirement to support sustainable places. At present, large developments are taking place with massive implications on the local demand for school</p>		

places and GPs. In the former this is resulting in larger class sizes and travelling out of local catchment to access nursery and primary facilities. In the latter case resulting in a direct increase in the pressure experienced within A&E of hospitals. There needs to be a much stronger reference to the impact of individual planning applications. There needs to be far more evidence provided on the capacity of local services to be able to accommodate further local growth within this context, for example analysis of average times for a routine doctor's appointment. Where deficiencies are identified additional funds need to be effectively secured through s106/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The LDP also has an important role in identifying these needs and would be part of any viability assessment at the plan stage.

<b>Q18</b>	Do you agree that giving greater emphasis to the transport hierarchy will improve the location and design of new development? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

While the inclusion of the transport hierarchy is to be welcomed, on its own it does not confer any binding obligation on developers to prioritise active travel. While it should remain in the document, it needs to be framed by a strong policy narrative focused on prioritising walking, cycling and public transport over other modes of travel. The policy must be strongly worded in a way that it represents a definite shift in policy from active travel provision being an optional choice (i.e. something which is desirable but non-essential) to it being a non-negotiable and essential requirement that must be prioritised in all developments. Anything less would represent an endorsement of 'business as usual' and would fail to signal the shift in planning policy that is required to secure the important contribution of planning and new development to the delivery of the Active Travel Act.

Links to the earlier section on community facilities, retail and design need to be emphasised. For example if there are good quality services available locally then people will generally access them through walking and cycling, if routes are safe. If the services available locally are substandard or don't have capacity to accommodate a growth in population, people will have to travel further to access facilities regardless of the infrastructure available.

The availability of revenue funding to support public transport services is a key constraint in making it effective. There is a need for more effective integration between transport planning and land use planning to put in place mechanisms that will link development proposals with revenue funding for bus services, if the dependence of communities on access by car is to be lessened.

The LDP will play a role in setting requirements and identifying active travel networks. However this policy must be carried through into the determination of individual planning applications and the use of tools such as S106 / CIL as key delivery mechanisms.

<b>Q19</b>	Do you agree that the policy will enable the planning system to facilitate active travel and the provisions of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

### Further comments

The Active Travel Act makes no direct reference to the planning system in Wales and requires no specific contribution to the delivery of the Act by LPA functions. This is in spite of the profound influence of the planning system upon the design and use of the built environment and the movements generated across the local highway and transport networks - movements which create many of the problems which the Active Travel Act sets out to remedy.

This dis-connect between the duties conferred by the Act and the planning system has been highlighted in our evidence to the National Assembly for Wales' Economy, Infrastructure and Skills Committee and the Cross Party Active Travel Group. We have called for a strengthening of the linkage between the Act and the planning system by ensuring that provision for active travel through the development process is made a "central and essential requirement" of new developments rather than something which is regarded as optional.

PPW is a major opportunity to achieve the stronger linkage between the Active Travel Act and the planning system that is clearly essential. This can be achieved by reframing planning policy in a way which ensures that new development and infrastructure brought forward through the planning process is located and designed in a way which fully supports the ambition and practical delivery of the Active Travel Act, particularly the development of the high quality local walking and cycling networks which the Act seeks to achieve. Without this linkage there is real risk that any gains made by local authorities in retrofitting active travel infrastructure within their existing urban realm, could be cancelled out by developments which fail to provide active travel infrastructure of an appropriate quality and/or do not integrate with the wider active travel network, whilst generating additional car trips which make roads and neighbourhoods less conducive to travel by active modes.

For Active Travel to be successful, the efforts and investment of local authorities in re-engineering their road networks and building new and better routes for pedestrians and cyclists needs to be matched in the design and delivery of all new developments. As local authorities in Wales gear up to implement routes in their Active Travel Integrated Network Maps, the current revision of PPW provides a very timely opportunity to strengthen planning policy in relation to active travel and to help achieve the much-needed synergy between active travel provision in new developments and the delivery of local active travel local active travel networks.

The references to the Active Travel Act in paragraphs 1.25 and 1.26 in Chapter 1 of the document are noted and welcomed. However, the crucial role the planning system and the development process in supporting the delivery of the Active Travel Act needs to be emphasised far more strongly. It should be expanded to ensure that new development

also includes provision for active travel within it, and within the wider network beyond the site.

The document makes reference to the role of the planning system in steering development to the right locations. However, it must also explain the role of planning policy and development management in ensuring that developments are designed and integrated with existing settlements in a way which makes active travel a practical and attractive travel choice.

Active travel has greater coverage in the draft document than previous editions of PPW, which is to be welcomed. However, the document still fails to confer any effective obligation on the developers of land to properly incorporate active travel routes and facilities and contribute to the development of active travel networks with their schemes. As in previous editions of PPW, active travel is presented as a desirable thing to encourage and promote through development rather than an essential component of development schemes. Experience shows that policy framed in this way has failed to 'nudge' developers towards providing the standard of active travel infrastructure which is required to support travel behaviour change. If the planning system and development process is to effectively support the Active Travel Act, this weakness must be addressed in the new edition of the PPW. This is why the document must be amended so that it explicitly requires accessibility by active travel modes to be prioritised over access by other modes both in the location and design of new developments.

<b>Q20</b>	Do you agree that the policy will enable the creation of well-designed streets? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
In principle the policy will enable the creation of well-designed streets. However there needs to be a closer alignment between the requirements of planning policy and that of the Highways Authority. We are not convinced that Manual for Streets is fully accepted.		

<b>Q21</b>	Do you agree with the requirement for non-residential development to have a minimum of 10% of car parking spaces with ULEV charging points? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

We support this requirement, although acknowledging that technology changes at a fast rate and this policy may need to be revised at some point in the future.

Paragraph 4.122 could usefully cross reference the additional policy requirements for ULEVs within paragraph 3.149.

<b>Q22</b>	Do you agree with the issues and inter-linkages highlighted in the introduction to the Productive and Enterprising Places chapter? What other issues and linkages could be identified to support this theme?	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

We note that much of the introduction of this chapter may appear repetitive, but this may assist in emphasising the Planning Principles etc. in the context of Productive and Enterprising Places.

<b>Q23</b>	Do you agree with the changes to Telecommunications section of the draft PPW? If not, what other changes could be made to clarify the situation? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

We support the proposals for telecommunications. However we would suggest that an additional criteria is to consider the impact / interaction on neighbouring uses, which may conflict e.g. signaling equipment.

<b>Q24</b>	Do you agree with the location of the transport infrastructure section in the Productive and Enterprising Places chapter? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>We support the inclusion of transport infrastructure section in the Productive and Enterprising Places Chapter, acknowledging that the new format of PPW requires users to consider all sections. There may be difficulties in doing this, and will require a different way of using the document which may take time.</p>		

<b>Q25</b>	Do you agree with the new requirements for local renewable energy planning as set out in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>x</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>RTPI Cymru supports the need for decarbonisation and the need for renewable energy generation, as well as the need for energy saving.</p> <p>We support the preparation of local authority renewable energy resource plans to help inform local authority renewable energy targets. The 70% target by 2020 is a challenging target, and needs to be considered alongside the landscape constraint in Wales.</p> <p>We question the statement at paragraph 4.125, “take into account the likely mechanisms for determining applications for sites based on their potential and actual output”. The consenting regime (planning applications under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, developments of national significance (DNS) under the Planning (Wales) Act 2015; nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs) under the Planning Act 2008) are determined by the ‘installed capacity’ of the generating station in megawatts (MW). The potential / actual output of the site in megawatt hours (MWh) is a complex calculation based on the rated capacity and power curves of each wind turbine and the wind regime (direction, speed, turbulence) at the site. At the planning stage, this would involve modelling a number of different turbines resulting in a number of different MWh figures. We question this change and suggest further discussion around the most appropriate approach – installed capacity or potential/actual output.</p>		

While we broadly support the approach at paragraph 4.135 – 4.141 to ‘Large Scale Wind Energy Development’, both Technical Advice Note (TAN) 8: Renewable Energy and Strategic Search Areas (SSA) need updating to avoid confusion. TAN 8 was published in 2005 and its assumptions on turbines (rated capacity, tip heights etc.) are now out of date (i.e. TAN8 figures are based on 2.0MW turbines, where technological advances now mean that 3.5-4.0MW turbines are the norm).

Paragraph 4.141 is concerned with wind energy development outside SSAs. This paragraph is only appropriate under the heading of “Large Scale Wind Energy Development” if it is concerned with large scale energy and we would therefore ask if this is to be encouraged outside SSAs.

We recommend that the word “generally” should be removed from paragraph 4.139, to provide clarity.

<b>Q26</b>	Do you agree with the use of the energy hierarchy for planning as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>x</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
The proposed energy hierarchy is to be welcomed, with reducing demand and conserving energy as the key priorities. However, there is a need for more understanding on the roles of local planning authorities in these processes.		

<b>Q27</b>	Do you agree with the approach taken to coal and onshore oil and gas as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why. Please consider each source separately.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
RTPI Cymru supports in principle the policy approach to oil, coal and gas and the need for decarbonisation.		



<b>Q28</b>	Do you agree with the approach taken to promoting the circular economy and its relationship to traditional waste and minerals planning as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
Yes we support this approach.		

<b>Q29</b>	Do you agree with the issues and inter-linkages highlighted in the introduction to the Distinctive and Natural Places chapter? What other issues and linkages could be identified to support this theme?	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
Yes we support the issues and interlinkages in the Distinctive and Natural Places chapter.		

<b>Q30</b>	Do you agree with the approach taken to landscape, biodiversity and green infrastructure? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

### Further comments

The clarity provided on the Sandford Principle as it applies to the National Parks is welcomed. This principle would appear to be equally relevant to AONBs in Wales. The update of PPW is a good opportunity to make this explicit.

The sections on green infrastructure are welcomed, but there is a need for more emphasis on the responsibilities of developers as well as LPAs in ensuring that high quality green and blue infrastructure is included within new development.

<b>Q31</b>	Do you agree with the approach taken to distinctive coastal? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

### Further comments

RTPI Cymru supports the approach taken to distinctive coastal areas.

The Wales Marine Plan needs to be better integrated with the onshore planning system, linking with the various spatial plans that impact on the coast including LDPs, Area Statements, Development Advice Maps and Shoreline Management Plans.

Seascape should be recognised as an important consideration.

<b>Q32</b>	Do you agree with the approach taken to air quality and soundscape? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

### Further comments

There is much to be supported in this section, in particular the need to separate incompatible land uses, a factor which is becoming increasingly common as parts of former industrial sites are redeveloped for housing whilst some of the site is still in active industrial use.

The recognition of need for the planning system, alongside other legislation in reducing the population's exposure to noise and air pollution is welcome.

The need for LPAs to consider the likely noise and air quality impacts of a development on the environmental, amenity and health is already enshrined within the EIA regulations so it is helpful that PPW requires all development to be assessed in a similar manner.

However, we question how LPAs are going to consider the current and future sources of air and noise pollution when developing strategies for locating new development beyond what can already be achieved with the current Use Classes Order. Uses within Class B2 are not normally located next to sensitive uses such as housing due to their potential adverse impacts on the amenity of residents. Does PPW envisage a more sophisticated approach?

Resources and skills within LPAs will also need consideration. LPAs will require technically competent officers to review any assessment submitted and assess the air quality and noise impacts of any proposed development.

<b>Q33</b>	Do you agree with the approach taken to water services as contained in the draft PPW? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

**Further comments**

In principle, the approach taken to water services is supported. However many of the comments at the start of the section in respect of the use of combined sewers, especially in the South Wales Valley areas appear aspirational. Much of the area is serviced by Victorian constructed infrastructure and current development pressures are exceeding their capacities. The question is how an increase in capacity will be funded and this will need to be an issue addressed during the LDP process, particularly the viability phase, as well as at the individual site application stage.

It is important to recognise the complexities around the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure to enable development to come forward. Water companies will normally advise of infrastructure improvements required to meet levels of housing growth. However, the water industry's ability to plan their investment programmes in alignment with LDPs through their Asset Management Plans is constrained by the way in which their investment programmes are planned, and how the funding for those programmes via charges to customers is agreed through Ofwat's periodic review processes. This can lead to water companies insisting that new housing sites are phased towards the latter end of LDP planning horizons, creating risks of shortfalls in the earlier phases of LDPs. There is a need for more effective systems to co-ordinate water Industry investment programmes with LDP preparation processes.

The need to develop a strategic long term approach to infrastructure provision when preparing development plans. It is therefore recommended that infrastructure provision is considered at a strategic / regional basis and the process engages all utility providers.

There is no reference to water quality in rivers which is a major issue for water companies. The pollution of water courses in rural areas, by, for example anaerobic digestion (AD) plants and other farming activities is a major concern in Wales and planning guidance should recognise this issue.

The section on development and flood risk notes that many settlements are at risk of flooding and that hard flood measures may no longer be appropriate. However, PPW is silent on planning for 'managed retreat' and the redevelopment in settlements at risk of

flooding, it would be helpful to clarify if this should be allowed, as it is currently a challenging issue for planners.

The link between green infrastructure and SuDS is welcomed. We are concerned that the LPA and even developers may not have the technical competence and resources to “promote and encourage increased efficiency and demand management of water as part of new developments”. Perhaps some technical guidance should be produced on this matter. We also anticipate these measures will come through building regulations as well as the planning system.

There is a need to include a reference to the importance of collaboration between the LPA and the Lead Local Flood Authority.

With Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 in the process of being brought into operation, this section of PPW needs to be updated to offer guidance on the role of SuDS Approval Bodies, and the way in which their role will interface with that of the LPA.

<b>Q34</b>	Do you agree with the approach taken to addressing environmental risks and a de-risking approach? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Disagree</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>While we do not disagree with the overall principle of this section, we do find it confusing. At the start of the section it is suggested the role of LPAs is to facilitate awareness of environmental hazards and risks which may be communicated to developers. This would be achieved by all stakeholders sharing data to benefit existing and future projects, with the LPAs acting as the curator of this data. The data will be provided by developers and they are also responsible for determining the extent and effects of hazards associated with the site and proposed development.</p> <p>This approach assumes developers are willing to share information, which they have commissioned, with their competitors. There is also a question as to the validity / accuracy of the data. Is the LPA expected to technically review all reports, do they have the technical competence, time and resources? To be of any value the information held by the LPA must be valid.</p> <p>Much of the information relating to ground conditions, contamination and other hazards would be obtained as part of the EIA process.</p>		

<b>Q35</b>	Do you agree that other than those policy statements referred to in Questions 1 to 33 above, the remainder accurately reflect the existing policy? If not, please explain why.	<b>X</b>
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>X</b>
	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	
	<b>Disagree</b>	

### Further comments

We have a number of comments on other policies which we have included below.

#### **General comment: Retail**

Over the next 10 years retailing and the future of our town centres will be a key challenge. There is massive economic restructuring taking place across all retail sectors, including those with a large presence out of town and in town. In order to keep town centres alive there may need to be an emphasis on supporting businesses which do not have an online presence and which may be different to traditional high street occupants. Town centres will be as much about the social experience as the retail. LAs need to be prepared for this change.

We would recommend more emphasis on retail change within the retail section. This is important for a number of social and economic reasons. How relevant are retail impact assessments in accurately determining local expenditure and how much of this is conveyance versus comparison when there is so much on line expenditure?

#### **General comment: Welsh language**

While there has been a large increase in discursive material related to other topics this version of PPW has less background setting out the approach of the Welsh Government to the place of the Welsh language in communities.

In particular further consideration is needed in relation to paragraph 2.51 which is unclear and poorly worded. It suggests Language Impact Assessments (LIA) 'may' be carried out 'if required' on large developments not allocated in development plans. It should be made clear who decides where that is required (i.e. the LPA) and should state that such assessments should be carried out and to avoid doubt that a failure to do so could be taken into account in determining an application.

We also consider the use of the term 'large' is so general as to be unhelpful, as a scheme of 200 may not be large in one situation but a scheme of 20 homes would be large in the context of a small settlement. It would be far more useful to use a term such as 'a development likely to have a significant impact on a community by virtue of its scale'. In addition the policy as drafted does not recognise that one purpose of a LIA is to generate measures which could improve the language impact of a development and help it gain local support. A possible way of reflecting that positive role of assessments could be a sentence such as 'developers putting forward planning applications for allocated housing sites may in some cases wish to produce voluntary LIA to identify ways their proposals can contribute to the well being of the Welsh Language'. Thresholds / criteria for the LIA should be clearly set out in LDP policy with supporting evidence.

**General comment: Flood risk**

Para 5.7 Flood risk management should be added into this paragraph - "A Resilient Wales can be supported by protecting sufficient scales, extent and connectivity of, and between, landscapes and habitats to enable them to withstand the pressures of change, to tackle pollution and flood risk, allow for the protection of water resources and quality, the creation of carbon sinks especially in urban areas, and promoting opportunities for social and economic activity based on valuing and enabling access to the natural and built environment."

**General comment: Energy (undergrounding)**

At paragraph 4.110 – 4.112 the Welsh Government sets out its 'preferred position' for "*new power lines is that they should be laid underground where possible*" recognising that a 'balanced view' should be taken against costs.

We agree with the principle of this policy and recognise what this policy is aiming to achieve. PPW could usefully recognise the issue of existing overhead power lines in sensitive locations, and encourage the identification of potential schemes for future investment in undergrounding existing lines and alternative routing and additional mitigation measures for existing lines.

However, we are very aware that every case is different and there will be different issues. We note as part of the EIA process, it is only necessary to 'mitigate' against significant impacts where these are deemed to be unacceptable – if the environmental impact of an overhead line is deemed to be 'acceptable', there should be no need to consider undergrounding. As part of the planning consideration, the decision-maker will assess the impacts of the development (positive and negative) against the development plan and any other material considerations before reaching a balanced view on the proposal. Furthermore, developers are required to follow the guidelines set out in the 'Holford Rules' which are intended as a common sense approach to the routing of new overhead lines. The 'preferred position' that they should be laid underground where possible could be viewed as being at odds with accepted EIA and planning processes, as well as specific guidelines on designing grid infrastructure.

We also note the Welsh Government have set ambitious targets for the generation of renewable energy (paragraph 4.104). These targets are set in the context of reduced or no support for future renewable energy projects (as a result of the closure of the Renewables Obligation (RO) scheme and the possible exclusion of onshore wind from future Contracts for Difference (CfD) auctions); such projects may therefore struggle with viability. Grid makes up a significant proportion of the capital expenditure (CAPEX) costs for renewable energy / storage projects, and experience shows that undergrounding is generally significantly more expensive than overhead lines. The Welsh Government's own targets are already challenging but may be even harder to achieve if decision-makers attach too much weight to the 'preferred position' on undergrounding. Further consideration of the many issues and processes, guidance etc is required.

**General comments: Gypsies and Travellers**

The emphasis at paragraph 3.49 given to assessment and allocation of sites for Gypsies and Travellers is welcome. However, the advice needs to be strengthened with "must" replacing "should". - "*Where a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies an unmet need, a planning authority must allocate sufficient sites in their development plan to ensure that the identified pitch requirements for residential and/or transit use can be met.*"

**General Comments: Landscapes**

At paragraph 2.37, landscape should be promoted from the third sentence into the second

sentence as a primary consideration, reading "... a development is well-integrated into the existing built environment fabric and into the landscape".

Paragraph 5.113 could usefully contain reference to, and recognise the significance of seascape. It should also cross reference the work completed as part of the marine plan on marine character areas.

Paragraph 5.124 could also contain reference to the significance of seascape. We support the approach to integrated policy making with Area Statements (identified in para 5.177). An additional paragraph could identify the need for integrated policy making and support for joining up the various spatial plans at or near the coast (LDP, Marine Plan, Area Statements, Development Advice Maps and Shoreline Management Plans). This section should also emphasise the need for greater joint working, cooperation and coordination of resources at or near the coast and then joining up policy communication.

#### **General Comment: Historic environment**

There are instances where PPW10 uses the word "should", in dealing with the historic environment, but the word "must" would be more appropriate. Given the subjective nature of the word "should" this would be very likely to cause uncertainty and open up policy to challenge. Thus the following paragraphs should read as follows:

- "5.86 The demolition of any listed building must be considered as exceptional and require the strongest justification."
- "5.88 There must be a general presumption in favour of the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas."
- "5.92 Planning authorities should value, protect and conserve the special interest of parks and gardens included on the register of historic parks and gardens in Wales. The register must be taken into account in planning authority decision making."

#### **General comments: Conservation areas**

Paragraph 5.88 should be strengthened to secure better outcomes as follows -

"Conservation area appraisals and management plans should be prepared and regularly reviewed to assist planning authorities in the exercise of their development management functions."

Paragraph 5.89 should be strengthened to help safeguard the character of conservation areas - "There is a strong presumption against the granting of planning permission for developments, including advertisements, which damage the character or appearance of a conservation area or its setting to an unacceptable level. In exceptional cases, and where every effort is made to mitigate any damage, the presumption may be overridden in favour of development considered desirable on public interest grounds."

<b>Q36</b>	Are there any existing policy statements in PPW Edition 9 which you think have not been included in the draft of PPW Edition 10 and you consider should be retained? If so, please specify.	<b>X</b>
<b>Agree</b>		
<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>		
<b>Disagree</b>		
<b>Further comments</b>		
<p>We believe that PPW Edition 9 was more explicitly worded with regard to sites that come forward during the plan period for Gypsy and Traveller sites. The proposed draft appears to place onus on site allocations; but we would recommend the ability to deal with sites that may come forward during the Plan period through a criteria based policy would be helpful also.</p> <p>There are concerns with regards to the historic environment (paras 5.76 - 5.106) because much of the content of PPW (edition 9) does not appear in draft edition 10. As the draft currently stands, the guidance is less prescriptively worded than Edition 9. Information from PPW Edition 9 on historic environment objectives and organisational responsibilities should be included, along with guidance on development plans and development management, and key references to legislation and TANs.</p>		