

Question 2 - Comments made on the Candidate Site Register

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
3967 Mrs C Alabaster		125 West of Feidr Fawr, Dinas Cross	HOWEVER Sites 125 (Feidr Fawr) and 134 and the new area of No. 136 to me seem to be the most suitable as no back gardens look onto those sites. (I do not remember which sites had been re-sized and re-designated according to your latest plan.)	Support for these sites is noted. The impact upon neighbouring amenity forms a material planning consideration and has been considered as part of the site assessment process. It forms one of many different considerations in this respect which all need to be afforded appropriate weight whilst considering the merits of a site.
3468 Ms Mary Sinclair, Campaign for Protection of Rural Wales		General	Yes - Candidate sites should be reassessed against the new Predictive maps of the revised Agricultural Land Classification which distinguishes grades 3a from 3b and reassesses the areas of each Grade. The Best and Most Versatile Land includes grade 3a which at last can be identified.	This assessment has been undertaken.
1663 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	0 General	0 General	With regard to the Candidate Sites Register, we are pleased to see that the LPA has taken into account our infrastructure comments in their site assessments.	Noted.
4569	0 General	0 General	No amendment needed.	Noted

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd (White, Young, Green) 4F Retail Tenby				
2873 Angle Community Council	Angle	116 East of West Bay Close, Angle	Angle Community Council feel sites 117 and 118 should remain as they are for agricultural purposes but would support in principle (subject to confirmation of sewage reports), the development at Site 116 to provide appropriate affordable housing for 10 dwellings for local village based families. Link to full submission: Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCRep.pdf Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCSite117.pdf Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCSite118.pdf	Support, in principle, for site 116 is noted.
2873 Angle Community Council	Angle	117 West of Angle Caravan Park, Angle	Angle Community Council feel sites 117 and 118 should remain as they are for agricultural purposes but would support in principle (subject to confirmation of sewage reports), the development at Site 116 to provide appropriate affordable housing for 10 dwellings for local village	The assessment of site 117 concludes that it would not be appropriate to develop which accords with this comment from the Community Council.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>based families. Link to full submission: Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCRep.pdf Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCSite117.pdf Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCSite118.pdf</p>	
2873 Angle Community Council	Angle	118 North of West Bay Close, Angle	<p>Angle Community Council feel sites 117 and 118 should remain as they are for agricultural purposes but would support in principle (subject to confirmation of sewage reports), the development at Site 116 to provide appropriate affordable housing for 10 dwellings for local village based families. Link to full submission: Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCRep.pdf Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCSite117.pdf Electronic Reps\2873AngleCCSite118.pdf</p>	<p>It is not considered that a small-scale development of up to 5 dwellings within the site identified as 118A would cause visual intrusion from the west as the site would be screened by existing hedgerows. The area identified as appropriate for development is directly adjacent to the Centre boundary and existing development. The pattern of development should not extend any further north than the extent of the existing property curtilages. The amount of new development that can be accommodated in Angle is constrained by the availability of the sewage system capacity and site access from the highway. The assessments have identified sites 116 and 118A as opportunities for</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>exceptional land releases for 100% affordable housing provision. It is not intended to allocate the sites nor to include them within the Centre boundary.</p> <p>Recommend no change to the site assessment.</p>
4587	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill Dinas Cross	<p>Site 124 does not appear at all appropriate. As to drainage, water during rain water runs off the field in large amounts as it is. It will be the worse if covered with impervious surfaces as must be where housing is added. The sewage works below struggle with demand as it is and would be wholly inadequate to deal with yet more dwellings. Road access is poor already in all senses once you leave the A road.</p> <p>As with all these ideas, one has to question the need? There are always dozens of houses for sale in and around Dinas, many on the market for a long time. Those that do sell tend to be successful because of the views and rural feel. That would be spoiled obviously if 50 houses were placed as proposed. A site less</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment has been updated (see Candidate Site Register) in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			intrusive to the views and natural appearance of the area would be much more appropriate. Dinas looks really good from the viewpoint up Spring Hill. That view, as an example, would be much spoiled.	
4584 Mr & Mrs Jones	Dinas Cross	Various	Various comments on candidate sites. Electronic Reps\4584JonesRep.pdf	An 8 week consultation period was held for the Preferred Strategy which included advertisement in the Pembrokeshire Herald, publication on the Authority's website with web access available in Newport Tourist Information Centre and mail notification to statutory consultees (including Town and Community Councils) and those included on the Authority's mailing list. Town and Community Councils were given prior notification of the consultation period with workshops held to inform and discuss the process with them. The public meeting held was on request of Dinas Cross Community Council, which was

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>responsible for advertising the meeting to local residents.</p> <p>It is agreed that further development using the existing Spring Hill access onto the A487 and the narrow lane itself would be unacceptable on highway safety grounds. Welsh Government Trunk Road Agency has advised access directly from the A487 could be possible.</p> <p>Comments referring to trees and hedgerow, protected species and sewerage capacity are noted. It is unclear whether these comments are generic or relate to a specific site. Advice has been taken from Dwr Cymru who advise sewerage capacity exists for limited development within Dinas Cross including the section of land to the rear of Spring Hill (see Maps 013A, 054A, 074A, 095A and 135A on the Candidate Site</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>Register) Existing trees and hedgerow on sites will be protected where appropriate although a threat may exist for example where the creation of an access is required. The Authority's Biodiversity Officer has advised further on the biodiversity status of sites and the Site Assessments have been updated accordingly.</p> <p>The visual impact of the development of the land to the rear of Spring Hill (including from the viewpoint to the south) has been considered and only the north eastern section was found to be acceptable (see Maps 013A, 074A and 095A on the Candidate Site Register).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that land to the rear of Spring Hill is boggy; any development scheme would need to address this via a suitable drainage scheme. Any development scheme would</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>also need to adequately protect the amenity of neighbouring properties. Development would be unacceptable if these issues could not be resolved.</p> <p>Support for Site 136 subject to a roundabout is noted. This site is not proposed for allocation within the Deposit Local Development Plan, however the submission of an Exception Site proposal could be considered acceptable subject to detailed consideration of all material planning considerations.</p>
4565 Mrs J R Williams	Dinas Cross	105 Nyth y Wennol, Dinas Cross	<p>As not to be confused as to where to write my comments I've noted them below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This sites is a picturesque site and is on a slope which if houses were to be built would lose the unique look of a beautiful field with oak trees and natural wildlife, sea views etc. Also its at present a tranquil quiet escape. •Sheep graze here and is looked after by local farmer. •Lane is too narrow to provide traffic especially delivery lorries. 	<p>The objections are noted. The Site Assessment concludes that development at this location would be unacceptable due to the detrimental landscape and amenity impact also taking into account the impact of necessary highway improvements, the existing Green Wedge and Open Space designations.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is a stream along the borderline which will have to be crossed over. •Even if the applicant changes his mind to provide just one house it would still not be a suitable field to build on. Hence its beauty and the nature of the field. •House values would also be de-valued with having a new build here be it one or more houses/bungalow <p>My views are matched to my other neighbours in this area that are against building on this land (in any way or means).</p>	
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	105 – Land adjacent Nyth y Wennol, Dinas Cross	I have in front of me a copy of the 'Sustainability Appraisal' together with the map of our locality for the Site 105 proposed for building a large number, I believe 14, housing units. My interest in this proposal is very obvious as the field in question is exactly opposite all front windows and door of our cottage. That is we can see that the field is exactly between our home and the sea. The land in question runs from within 10 metres of our home where we live permanently and on to the horizon" with the sea.	Support for the Authority's assessment noted.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>We have borne without complaint the building of the house 'Hesgfan' on the site to our left which was a garden site. We did not oppose this (except when three houses were applied for). We are in our middle seventies and feel that we cannot live with the idea of having to go through the noise of machinery, dust and/or mud on our lane as well as the loss of the beautiful sound of the stream, the lovely hedgerow and the wonderful views. This may seem selfish to deprive people of much needed homes. However I doubt that this would be the case as the site would be a very expensive site to develop for affordable housing (from the existing agricultural land - it is currently rented to a farmer who runs sheep there and also reaps a harvest of hay). We feel that any houses built there could not possibly end up being 'affordable'. The aims of providing much needed homes for those trying to get on the housing ladder would be totally missed. This puts them in the category of attracting wealthy people who want second homes either for holiday lets or for themselves. I feel that the houses built would not, therefore, be used to 'house the needy' because of costs</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>escalating due to: installation of drainage, mains water, electricity, gas and also levelling of the ground and felling of trees etc. You have judged in your appraisal that the site would be deemed to be unsuitable for the following reasons which I agree with - ie: Access on to the site would depend of breaching the stream (or piping it) at a point in the narrow lane where it would totally destroy the area of the ancient Baptising Pool, the trees, the hedgerows, and if site access therefore had to farther down the lane it would be exactly opposite our front gate and our windows.</p> <p>1. I regret and propose to oppose it for the sake of the ecology of our area - it would change a well-husbanded and farmed greenfield site into an overcrowded brownfield site in an area of natural beauty.</p> <p>2. This lane is well used by walkers on their way to join the coastal path at 'Aberbach' - and 'Pwll Gwaelod' - in fact the bus stops by the tennis court opposite the green area especially to drop off walkers who pass down the lane.</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>3. Destroying hedgerows - destroys natural habitat of the many birds in this area – it also destroys the natural beauty of the area.</p> <p>4. Piping the stream destroys the sensual pleasure of hearing it bubbling on its way to the sea at Aberbach.</p> <p>5. Lastly but by no means the least - a housing estate, or in fact even only one house built to interrupt the skyline on this field would ruin the pleasure of the view and especially the glorious sunsets over the sea at this point.</p> <p>6. For us personally - we decided to move here from the Wolfscastle area and have made it our retirement home and wanted to stay here in peace and tranquillity until the end of our days. We are not alone in this aim - most of us at this end of Dinas just want to enjoy nature's tranquillity in our old age. We are not worrying about the loss of £s value on our property - we have no intention of selling - unless of course, we can't live with the development opposite our own front door and so close by as we find this a totally unreasonable proposal for planning an estate of this size.</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>Do we really want to eat into all the pleasures of offering and promoting our Pembrokeshire Coast National Park to our much needed visitors? Is not the tourist industry of this area in need of promoting more and more in terms of income for the County? In fact is it not perhaps our main source of income for the younger generation - how else can we attract the younger generations to remain in the County to provide a balance in our communities?</p> <p>Is not the ecology of the area a factor? If it becomes any less important - the Earth is doomed to destruction. If people want to build and live in large groups together – please place the homes in already developed areas within town boundaries or already developed areas.</p> <p>We have read and considered all the points mentions in the Sustainability Appraisal and agree totally with the Conclusions of the NP that this site is totally unsuitable. We would be most grateful to be kept in touch with the situation and would do our best to attend</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			any planning proposal meetings for Dinas.	
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	General – Candidate Site Meeting at Dinas Cross	Thank you for your reply dated 1 June to my letter. My husband and I attended the above meeting on Tuesday evening. We were pleased at the openness of the meeting and especially for the presence of the representative of 'Planning Aid Wales' - Elwyn (I cannot remember Elwyn's surname) but he stated that NOW is the time to make our views and worries known to the PCNP/LDP. So we do so now! We were also grateful for your presentation by Mr Lewis and Sarah who showed the presentation to us. It was also good to have the presence of Bob Kilmister and to have his clear and simple explanations on some of the points made and questions asked. We thank you all.	Support for approach taken at the Dinas meeting noted.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	054 Land to the Rear of Angorfan, Dinas Cross	You have already received my point of view as contained in my last letter to you but there are one or two points needing clarifying for us as a result of the meeting. So I would like to comment further: 1. My point of view is that all proposed pieces of land put forward as possible building sites should be chosen to make	The objection to these sites is noted. The impact upon neighbouring amenity forms a material planning consideration and has been considered as part of the site assessment process. It forms one of many different considerations in this respect which all need to be

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			likely the best relations with the people for whom the building would be affecting. That is NOT sites (054,074,032, and parts of 135) where building would be directly adjacent to back gardens of properties where they would deprive existing residents of the privacy of their own back gardens as in the Springhill area and all sites situated in Bryn Henllan 008. 092.AND 124. People who live in the countryside do so for many reasons - this being a major one of them.	afforded appropriate weight whilst considering the merits of a site. It is not uncommon for new development sites to be located adjacent to existing residential properties in development plans. This is in the interests of promoting sustainable new development which is well connected to existing centres and their services that can also be accommodated within existing landscape and environmental constraints. However, it is acknowledged that the impact upon existing amenity levels needs to be considered carefully.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster		032 – Rhoshelyg, Dinas Cross	See above for site number 054.	See above for site number 054.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	074 – Land at Spring Hill Dinas Cross	See above for site number 054.	See above for site number 054.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	135 (Parts of Site), Rear of Spring Hill and	See above for site number 054.	See above for site number 054.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
		Bro Helyg, Dinas Cross		
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	008 Bryn y Wawr Dinas Cross	See above for site number 054.	See above for site number 054.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	092 Lan adjacent Porthlisky, Dinas Cross	See above for site number 054.	See above for site number 054.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill Dinas Cross	See above for site number 054.	See above for site number 054.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	125 (Feidr Fawr)	However, sites 125(Feidr Fawr) and 134 and the new area of No 136 to me seem to be the most suitable as no back gardens look onto those sites.)	Support for these sites on privacy and amenity grounds is noted, the Authority agrees that no unacceptable impact would be caused in principle.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	134 Opposite Bay View Terrace	See above for Site 125.	See above for Site 125
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	136 Land South of A487...Castle Terrace Dinas Cross	See above for Site 125.	See above for Site 125
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	General – Dinas Cross	ALSO - NOT sites where buildings would interrupt the skyline of the coast and/or cliffs and visible from the Pembrokeshire	Adverse landscape visual impacts are a standard material planning consideration when

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			Coastal path and the Welsh National Coast Path. We don't want our many coastal path walkers to give up on us and go away from the County because it is no longer protected as being a place of peace, tranquillity and healthy pursuits.	assessing potential development sites. Views from areas such as the coastal path, where people visit for recreational purposes, for example to enjoy the landscape quality, are given a higher sensitivity weighting when considering landscape visual impact.
3967 Mrs C Alabaster	Dinas Cross	105 Land adj to Nyth y Wennol, Dinas Cross	<p>Re the site No.105 at 'Nyth-y-Wennol' opposite Pare Gwyn Bach, our home. We do understand it has received the 'red light' and is not approved of at all by PCNP - BUT we feel that if the same thing happened as happened to the field on the left of Parc Gwyn Bach - we remain nervous that as I asked in the meeting - Mr and Mrs Sharp's housing development agents could by-pass the PCNP decisions, even if they are final, and take their plans and representations directly to the Welsh Assembly thus ignoring the PCNP preferred strategy.</p> <p>We are not totally selfish on the question of building 'in our back yard' – because when the elderly owner of the field (known</p>	<p>The comments regarding the planning history of the site to the East of Site 105 are noted.</p> <p>The site assessment concludes that this site would be considered unacceptable on landscape and amenity impact grounds, also taking into account the Green Wedge status and Open Space designation.</p> <p>A clarification letter has been sent regarding the last paragraph of this representation.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>then as Anchor Down) approached us as he wanted to build himself a retirement bungalow there - we gave him our encouragement to do so - FOR ONE BUNGALOW in order for him to move out of his two storey house on the main road to a more suitable building. But his housing agent proposed that he apply for a 'farmyard development' of three houses on the same field - so our encouragement of his project stopped there and we opposed the new plan (as did many of our neighbours in the area). The PCNP turned down the proposals (we attended all the meetings) and the Agents for the owner of the field advised him to take it to the Welsh Assembly - one site at a time. He obtained from them permission to build two houses. We are happy that in the end a lovely couple bought the whole field from him and only built one house where they now live and the house is totally in keeping with this locality and is very pleasing to the eye.</p> <p>Any building work on Site 105 would also obscure their line of sight to the sea as it would be immediately in front of their driveway and new home</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>We wish to state that indeed, contrary to findings of the PCNP, Site 105 IS a wellfarmed 'greenfield' site and has 'green wedge' status. We chanced to see the farmer who farms the fields. He has an annual contract with Mr and Mrs Sharp of Nyth-yWennol and has farmed those fields for all the years Mr Sharp has lived there - nearly as long as we have lived at Parc Gwyn Bach (25 years). The farmer had not been told anything of the proposals to turn the fields into a building site and he has had sheep on the fields and will eventually mow for hay. He has husbanded those fields excellently over the years including fencing and hedge-cutting as well as fertilizing the land. So it is definitely a 'greenfield' site with a 'green wedge' status as per your current 'green wedge' status policy.</p> <p>So we, my husband and I, really need would appreciate that it will be impossible for the proposals for Site 105 to be taken to the Welsh Assembly either before or after the Inspector has made his decision regarding 'permission to build' and it has</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>been turned down officially by the Inspector. In other words - is his decision final to the PCNP only but open for reconsideration possibly by the Welsh Assembly? We really need an answer to this sticking point please as soon as you are able.</p>	
<p>4538 Mr & Mrs Armitstead</p>	<p>Dinas Cross</p>	<p>105 land adj. Nyth-y-Wennol, Dinas Cross</p>	<p>This proposal runs contrary to Pembrokeshire National Parks ethos - ie. This site application is on a Greenfield site in an area of natural beauty which should not be destroyed by new housing. Tourism is one of the main benefits to the area.</p> <p>The existing access to the site is across the village green (owned by a Barony) part of which is an unmade track, marked on OS maps as a footpath only. If the Bennetts Terrace road was to be developed for access, this would also involve the Barony and major expense.</p> <p>The boundary stream is also partly owned by the Barony and is subject to seasonal flooding, presenting further access problems to the proposed site.</p> <p>We would wish to highlight the already inadequate sewerage capacity in the area, having experienced sewerage overflow 2</p>	<p>The objections to the site and support of the Site Assessment conclusions are noted.</p> <p>The Site Assessment concludes that development at this location would be unacceptable due to the detrimental landscape and amenity impact also taking into account the impact of necessary highway improvements, the existing public right of way and the Green Wedge and Open Space designations. The Site Assessment also recognises that the site lies within an area prone to flood risk and that limited sewage capacity is available in Dinas Cross.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>years ago.</p> <p>There is an ancient “Baptistry” immediately adjacent to the site which would need to be preserved.</p> <p>We strongly agree with the concluding comments as to the detrimental environmental impact of this site and also the final “overall assessment” as unsuitable for housing development</p>	
4539 Tessa McWatt	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross	<p>The location of the development does not minimise demand for travel. The site is a considerable distance from services and amenities, a walk along a road without pavements or use of a car.</p> <p>Remove site 124 from the local development plan.</p> <p>I am a regular visitor and renter of accommodation in the Brynhenllan area, using the Park for walking and other recreational activities. The proposed development on site no. 124 would greatly hamper the natural beauty of this area of the Pak and would meant that I, my family, and the numerous friends and professional associates who visit regularly (at least twice a year), would be unlikely to return.</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>Fishguard lies outside of the jurisdiction of the National Park and this Local Development Plan.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>My suggestion would be to revitalise Fishguard, invest in regeneration, create jobs and a community that would attract developers as well as tourists and residents, this investment would also greatly benefit the Park and its residents, creating an overall greater wealth for the area. Please consider the importance of tourists to this area.</p> <p>In general we agree with the appraisal, and, in particular, the concluding non-acceptability of this site.</p>	
3843 Mr R & Miss N Harries, Dinas Cross	Dinas Cross	135 Rear of Spring Hill and Bro Helyg, Dinas Cross	<p>Following a public meeting at Yr Hen Ysgol Dinas, 27 June 2017, it was brought to our attention that Site 135, rear of Spring Hill and Bro Helyg, Dinas Cross had been designated as a ‘candidate site’ for development – Plan 1.</p> <p>Much of Site 135 is on ‘Castle Terrace land’ – indicated on Plan 2 by ‘<i>diagonal lines</i>’. This land is owned by my sister Non and myself and neither of us has put in any application for a candidate site here. We were wondering if you might have selected this area as a candidate site as part of the</p>	This site is not proposed for allocation within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The north east corner is however included within the revised Centre boundary, which formed part of a larger site identified in the Settlement Capacity Study for Dinas (2014). No land within the ownership of this representor is included within the revised Centre boundary.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>proposed development area for Dinas. We certainly have not been informed of this and were not sent any plans or details as others apparently were.</p> <p>The area of ‘Castle Terrace land’ indicated on Plan 2 with ‘<i>diagonal lines</i>’ is an important ‘environmental area’ on the farm and some of it has been planted with deciduous woodland. This area will not be available for any development now or in the foreseeable future and we ask you to withdraw the area outlined as ‘Castle Terrace land’ from any present or future plans for Candidate Sites in Dinas.</p>	
4544 Mrs K A Flinn	Dinas Cross	136 Land south of A487 south west of Castle Terrace Dinas Cross	<p>This site is in a much better position with regard to centralisation of the village, travel and access to amenities.</p> <p>Some road improvements may be needed but this would serve a dual purpose of slowing down traffic and making pedestrians safer.</p> <p>Why is this site a designated green wedge, but site 124 is not in your comments column as such?</p>	<p>Support for this site is noted. Due to deliverability uncertainties, this site is not proposed for allocation within the Deposit Local Development Plan, however a proposal for an affordable housing Exception Site could be considered acceptable subject to the consideration of detailed material planning considerations.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				Both assessments acknowledge the current Green Wedge designations under the existing Local Development Plan, which have also been reviewed as part of the replacement plan process. Site 124 is not proposed as a Green Wedge in the Deposit Local Development Plan due to the findings of the Settlement Capacity Study for Dinas Cross (2014). The Site Assessment has been updated accordingly.
4544 Mrs K A Flinn	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross	<p>This site is not compatible with National Park purposes or duty. It would have a strong detrimental effect on walkers enjoying the coastal path. The access is severely restricted.</p> <p>Below are listed comments on the Candidate Site Assessment proforma completed by the Authority.</p> <p>1- No, change 2 – The site is a green wedge 3 – Flowering meadow land 4 – Accessibility VERY restricted. Turning impossible, no access for fire engines or ambulances</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The existing Green Wedge</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>5 – No!! Narrow lanes, poor visibility, few pavements. 6 – Buses on main A487 only. I have never seen a train in Dinas Cross 7 – Yes, because it would no longer be an OPEN space 8 – Agreed 9 - Yes, sewage treatment is at capacity now! Why isn't Pwllgwaelod a blue flag beach? 10 – Agreed 11 – Agreed 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 – Has it ever been tested for such? 17 – Agreed 18 Yes, of course it will, bats seen in land adjacent to site 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 – Agreed 24 – Yes, the road floods at peak rainfall 25 – No, for reason at 24 26 – Agreed 27 – This site is a green wedge and as such it should be left strictly alone. I understood the ideals of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park is to enhance the beautiful scenery and make it a joy for visitors to come and enjoy the views, nature and peace.</p>	<p>designation is also included in the review process of the replacement Local Development Plan. The Settlement Capacity Study and subsequent Officer site visits have identified landscape capacity on this site for housing development. As such the Green Wedge status is not proposed for retention within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan.</p> <p>It is believed that comments relating to sites received refer to those received during the Preferred Strategy consultation stages (Sites 301 and 302). These comments are noted. Site Assessments for these can be viewed as part of the draft Deposit consultation in the New and Amended Sites Table.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>28, 29, 30 – Agreed</p> <p>I understand that further plots have been submitted. Plot A adjacent to Dinas Country Club and two further plots on the opposite side of the A487 to the Country Club entrance. Any of these plots would be in an ideal position for village amenities.</p>	
4554 Mr & Mrs D & C Hughes	Dinas Cross	Site 136A Land South of the A487, South West of Castle Terrace. Dinas Cross	<p>We support this site being included in the LDP for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would be a small development in keeping with other parts of the village. 2. It has good public transport except on Sundays (bus stop at entrance). 3. There are pavements all along the A487 to the village shops, recreation ground and village hall, approximately 1/2 mile away. 4. Although currently designated a Green Wedge this part of the field would have little impact on views from footpaths in the park. 5. If, as seems likely, the Highways Authority require a mini roundabout at the site entrance there is plenty of space and it should help to control the speed of traffic through the narrow part of Bwlch Mawr where the current speed limit is frequently ignored. 	<p>Support for this site is noted. Due to deliverability uncertainties, this site is not proposed for allocation within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan, however a proposal for an affordable housing Exception Site could be considered acceptable subject to the consideration of detailed material planning considerations.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
4554 Mr & Mrs D & C Hughes	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross	<p>We strongly oppose this site being included in the LDP for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would be a very large development (potentially 45 properties) on a current Green Wedge which, contrary to your initial assessment, is fully visible from the top of Dinas Head which is one of the most popular points on the coastal path. 2. The only access is by turning right off Feidr Fawr at an almost “blind” T junction onto a narrow lane (Yet yr Esgyrn) and then left between two properties into the site. We are aware that there is a longstanding boundary dispute which could make this access even narrower than it appears to be at present. We have also been informed that a recent GPS survey shows that it would not be possible satisfy the current regulations regarding sight lines either at the T junction or the site entrance. The nearest bus stop, village shops, hall and recreation ground are approximately 1/2 mile south along Feidr Fawr which has no pavement except for two short sections at Maes y Llan and opposite the former church hall which in 	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The strategy of the draft Deposit Local Development Plan is to locate development within/next to existing centres where services and amenities are more readily available to maximise sustainability and help to sustain and improve these services.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>total are less than 200 yards. There is a very narrow section between St Brynach’s churchyard and a cemetery opposite where there is no room for two cars to pass. If a pavement were to be provided along the remainder of Feidr Fawr it would result in it becoming effectively a single lane road for most of its length and therefore be unsuitable for even the present traffic volumes. Therefore we challenge your assessment that the local road network can accommodate the increase in traffic (probably an additional 180 vehicle movements per day).</p> <p>We also challenge your assessment that there is sufficient sewage capacity for this development. Although the site is adjacent to a sewage treatment plant, particularly after heavy rain, the run-off finds its way down to the marshland to the north and then west to the sea at Pwllgwaelod. This causes the beach to regularly fail the bathing water standards. Friends living in some as the properties along Yet yr Esgyrn tel us that they experience rising water levels in their drains and ground floor toilets.</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>There is little or no work available locally so where would the demand for a development of this size come from?</p> <p>We are not sure whether this comment is allowed, as we can find no reference to it in the assessments. Local medical services are already under significant strain with NHS dental services in particular almost non existent.</p>	
4548 Mr Andrew Poole	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross	<p>Safety concerns around increased traffic both during any construction but also importantly during ‘business as usual’. My concerns are around safety around access to Site number 124, and the additional traffic through the village. There are often ‘close calls’ with traffic around the blind corner adjacent to the proposed site access, so this needs to be considered.</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p>
4548 Mr Andrew Poole	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross	<p>Item 6 talks about public transport being available (assessment criteria ‘yes’) when it is nowhere near the site. If you are looking at people not using cars then</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			existing transport arrangements are not adequate. So the assessment is disigenous.	Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.
4548 Mr Andrew Poole	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross	There is no mention of ‘broadband’ capability, which is currently ‘poor’ to say the least in the village.	Noted. The strategy of the Deposit Local Development Plan is to locate development within/next to existing centres where services and amenities are more readily available to maximise sustainability and help to sustain and improve these services.
4548 Mr Andrew Poole	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross	There is no mention that the site is visible from Dinas Head.	Site visits conducted by Officers of the Authority included walking the coastal path to the North up to Dinas Head. It was considered that the landscape impact of development on this site within the context of Brynhenllan would be acceptable, when viewed from

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				the north, subject to further detailed consideration at planning application stage should one be submitted.
3626 Cllr R Kilmister	Dinas Cross	General	Firstly I am delighted that PCNPA has chosen to consult so well with local Community Councils and the general public. As part of my role as a County Councillor I have already attended 2 public meetings and a workshop in conjunction with Dinas Cross CC. I am very happy with the process so far and I hope that PCNPA will now listen to the views of the Community when coming to the next step. I am going to comment on 3 sites in particular on the strategy.	Noted.
3626 Cllr R Kilmister	Dinas Cross	Site 054 Land to the rear of Angorfan Bungalow and Dinas Cross Service Station	It is my belief that this site is suitable depending on exactly where any proposed housing would sit and the height of the buildings. The site is very close to the rear gardens of properties on Spring Hill. As the proposal lies due west of these properties they could be shaded and have their amenity considerably compromised. The possible extension of the shop, Post Office and garage would be welcomed as a desirable facility and help towards the sustainability of the Village	This site is not proposed for allocation in the Deposit Local Development Plan due to uncertainties over its deliverability. It is however included within the revised Centre boundary, along with neighbouring land to the south. Should a proposal be submitted, the impact upon neighbouring amenity will form a material consideration in the

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				determination process.
3626 Cllr R Kilmister	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill Dinas Cross	<p>I think this site is unsuitable for a number of very good reasons.</p> <p>1. In the last LDP this site was a green wedge and I cannot understand what has happened to dramatically alter PCNPA’s view on this site since the last LDP. A green wedge is a highly significant designation and to alter it to a development site within 5 years appears extremely controversial. This site is extremely visible from the Coastal Path at Dinas Head which has thousands of walkers using it each year. Development here would fundamentally alter the special characteristics of the National Park.</p> <p>2. It is poorly situated in terms of Village facilities and pedestrian access is via Feidr Fawr which has large sections without any footpath. It seems unlikely that any footpath could be constructed as the key area contains the Church graveyard. The road is already narrow and is very well used particularly in the summer to access the beach and already established housing. Increasing the traffic on this road is in my view highly undesirable. As this</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The current Green Wedge designation, along with all other existing designations has also been the subject of review as part of the replacement plan process. Due to the findings of the Settlement Capacity Study for Dinas (2014), which identified landscape capacity for development on this site, it was not considered appropriate to re-designate the site as a Green Wedge in the draft Deposit</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>site would have to include 50% affordable housing it must be envisaged that young families would have to use this potentially unsafe route to access the Village facilities.</p> <p>3. The access road proposed into the site is the subject of two neighbour disputes which go back many years and are I believe ongoing. The exact size of this small access into the field is disputed and I believe it could well be too small making the site undeliverable. The legal disputes already in place clearly will also threaten the deliverability of the site The surrounding road network is already under pressure and in my view is not suitable particularly in the summer months.</p> <p>4. This site would only be deliverable because of its location, sea views and desirability for developers. It could well allow expensive private housing which is not required in an effort to allow affordable provision in one small area of the site. It is my contention that this is the major reason that it has been selected rather than its overall suitability.</p>	<p>Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Cross subsidisation from market housing is required for affordable housing delivery (unless an Exception Site). The Land Implementation Study (December 2017) identifies an initial viability for 50% affordable housing provision from this site.</p>
3626 Cllr R Kilmister	Dinas Cross	Site 136A South of A487	This site is my preferred site for a development.	Support for this site is noted. Due to deliverability

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
		South West of Castle Terrace Dinas Cross	<p>It would require work by the Trunk Road Agency. The Community Council, Paul Davies AM and myself are going to make representations to the TRA that a roundabout at this site would slow traffic down into the 30 MPH zone at Bwlchmawr and would be extremely beneficial for traffic management. I fully understand that deliverability of the site would require SWTRA to complete these works and not a developer.</p> <p>The site has excellent level footpath access to the major facilities and is close to the Playing Field. It has bus stops already in place with brand new shelters. It will have no affect on the Special Characteristics of the National Park as development is already in place directly opposite. The site faces south and may be an ideal candidate for affordable housing possibly even using the Ty Solar model.</p>	<p>uncertainties, this site is not proposed for allocation within the Deposit Local Development Plan, however a proposal for an affordable housing Exception Site could be considered acceptable subject to the consideration of detailed material planning considerations.</p>
2882 Dinas Cross Community Council	Dinas Cross	General	<p>The council would like to thank the PCNP for organising and attending the recent meetings to discuss the future development plans for Dinas Cross.</p> <p>We have discussed several of the applications and wish to make the</p>	<p>Comments are noted, the Authority thanks the Council for its co-operation.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			following observations.	
2882 Dinas Cross Community Council	Dinas Cross	Site 054 Land to rear of Angorfan Bungalow and Dinas Cross Service Station	The council wish to support this proposal as it is very near to all services and in a good location within the community.	This site is not proposed for allocation in the Deposit Local Development Plan due to uncertainties over its deliverability. It is however included within the revised Centre boundary, along with neighbouring land to the south.
2882 Dinas Cross Community Council	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill	The council do not support this proposal as they feel it should be left as a green wedge. They also have concerns over the access as it is very narrow and could not be widened to accommodate a pavement. Finally the also raised concerns over adding to the already over capacity sewerage system, as Pwllgwaeod Beach already regularly fails the water sampling test.	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.
2882 Dinas Cross Community Council	Dinas Cross	Site 136A South of A487 South West of Castle Terrace.	The council support this proposal in principle but with the observations it would need careful planning as it is visible from Dinas Mountain. They also would like to point out that a new entrance would have to be constructed onto the main A487. The	Support for this site is noted. Due to deliverability uncertainties, this site is not proposed for allocation within the Deposit Local Development Plan, however a proposal for an

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			site is in a good location within the community and the land is unsuitable for any agriculture.	affordable housing Exception Site could be considered acceptable subject to the consideration of detailed material planning considerations.
3975Mr & Mrs R T B Porch	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill	<p>Amend - The assessment should be in accordance with your objectives and policies in your Preferred Strategy.</p> <p>a) This site is not compatible as it is designated as a Green Wedge. Development would therefore be contrary to your Preferred Strategy which is “the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Parks.” The National Park Management Plan objectives and policies must “therefore prevail over regional and local policy.” The site must be preserved as a Green Wedge to ensure that “the identity and character of towns and villages is not lost ... the identification of Green Wedges will assist in achieving this priority.” Site 124 is located in Brynhenllan which is a very small hamlet outside the centre of Dinas Cross. The retention of the Green Wedge</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The existing Green Wedge designation is also included in the review process of the replacement Local Development Plan. The Settlement Capacity Study and subsequent Officer site visits, including the coastal path to the North, have identified landscape capacity on</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>is necessary to preserve the character of the hamlet.</p> <p>b) The site is not viable as the access is inadequate and dangerous.</p> <p>c) The site is not compatible. The visual impact of any development would impact very unfavourably on the view from the coastal path around Dinas Head. This section of the coastal path is the most walked; in 2016 there were in excess of 31,000 walkers on this path. One of your objectives is to encourage more visitors to the National Park, not to discourage them with a blighted landscape.</p>	<p>this site for housing development. As such the Green Wedge status is not proposed for retention within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan,</p>
3975Mr & Mrs R T B Porch	Dinas Cross	Site 124 Land East of Tower Hill	<p>Detailed Site appraisal No – It is sited in Brynhenllan which is a small hamlet more than 1 km from the centre of Dinas Cross.</p> <p>The access to the site is too narrow. Exit is onto a single track lane and there is no visibility from the exit. Your Policy 53 states that Development will not be permitted where appropriate access cannot be achieved.</p>	<p>Whilst it is agreed that the site is located in Brynhenllan, this hamlet is grouped with the Dinas Cross Centre boundary within the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>No. The lane which runs past the exit is already very busy, partly due to the prevalence of Sat Navs which direct traffic coming from Fishguard direction to Cwm yr Eglwys along this lane. Feidr Fawr is very narrow in places (single track) and no pavements. Your Preferred Strategy is only to develop where it is safe for pedestrians, cyclists. Your Policy 53 states that Development will not be permitted where traffic is likely to generate an unacceptable impact.</p> <p>Buses run along the main road which is 1 km distant. People will use their cars, not walk.</p> <p>Sewage is at over capacity. Residents in Brynhenllan regularly experience blockages and backing up.</p> <p>The site supports an abundance of wildlife and is a transit passage to habitats for many including bats.</p> <p>Surface water run-off containing contaminants would not be absorbed by the land surrounding the site. This would</p>	<p>comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>inevitably flow downhill to the north and pollute the marsh in the valley between Pwllgwaelod and Cwm yr Eglwys which is currently is host to a diversity of fauna.</p> <p>Yes – Development would be disproportionate to the existing size of Brynhenllan. The site would be very visible from the coastal path, which would deter visitors. The proposed mitigation measures are totally inadequate; additional planting would take years to become effective.</p>	
4558 Mr D Morgan	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross.	<p>Please read comments on attached sheets with reference to Candidate Site assessment Section 1 Key questions A and Section 2 Detailed Appraisal Question 27 and Question 4.</p> <p>4558 Morgan pdf</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The existing Green Wedge designation is also included in</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				the review process of the replacement Local Development Plan. The Settlement Capacity Study and subsequent Officer site visits have identified landscape capacity on this site for housing development. As such the Green Wedge status is not proposed for retention within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan.
4560 Ms B Collins	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill, Dinas Cross.	Proposing as a Green Wedge under New Sites List and objecting to the site for residential development. 4560CollinsPDF	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study. A Site Assessment for the proposal for the site to be retained as a Green Wedge is included in the New and

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				Amended Sites Table under Site No. 303.
4555 M & Mrs Hughes	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill	Proposing as a Green Wedge under New Sites List and objecting to the site for residential development. 4555HughesPDF	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study. A Site Assessment for the proposal for the site to be retained as a Green Wedge is included in the New and Amended Sites Table under Site No. 303.
4555 M & Mrs Hughes	Dinas Cross	136A Land South of A487, South West of Castle Terrace, Dinas Cross	Support for Land South of A487, South West of Castle Terrace 4555HughesPDF	Support for this site is noted. Due to deliverability uncertainties, this site is not proposed for allocation within the Deposit Local Development Plan, however a proposal for an affordable housing Exception

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				Site could be considered acceptable subject to the consideration of detailed material planning considerations.
4562 R Holmes	Dinas Cross	124 East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site's development. 4562Holmes.pdf	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.
4579 Mr & Mrs Sharp	Dinas Cross	105 – Land adjacent Nyth y Wennol, Dinas Cross	Statement of support for the site's development. Electronic Reps\4579Haward.pdf Electronic Reps\4579Sharp.pdf Electronic Reps\4579Site105.pdf	The comments made have been noted, both the Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal have been re-considered an amended where appropriate. The overall conclusion that the site does not comply with the Preferred Strategy however remains the

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				same for the reasons given in the Site Assessment.
4566 – Roger and Pat Antell	Dinas Cross	124 – East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site’s development Electronic Reps\4566Antell.pdf	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.
4559 Nick Dovey	Dinas Cross	124 – East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site’s development Electronic Reps\4559DoveyRep.pdf	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
4567 Paul Young	Dinas Cross	124 – East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site’s development Electronic Repls\4567Young.pdf	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The claim of a detrimental impact upon tourism in the area has not been substantiated with evidence for consideration. The Authority considers that, on landscape grounds alone, the site has capacity for up to 20 units without causing an unacceptable detrimental impact upon the character of the area and surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Whilst there is no need for additional market housing per</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				se, there is an identified need for affordable housing and a lack of publicly available funds requires affordable housing provision to be cross-subsidised by market housing.
4563 Sarah Earl	Dinas Cross	124 – East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site’s development Electronic Reprs\4563Earl.pdf	In response to the comments relating to notification, an 8 week consultation period was held for the Preferred Strategy which included advertisement in the Pembrokeshire Herald, publication on the Authority’s website with web access available in Newport Tourist Information Centre and mail notification to statutory consultees (including Town and Community Councils) and those included on the Authority’s mailing list. Town and Community Councils were given prior notification of the consultation period with workshops held to inform and discuss the process with them. The public meeting held was on request of Dinas Cross

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>Community Council, which was responsible for advertising the meeting to local residents.</p> <p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The existing Green Wedge designation is also included in the review process of the replacement Local Development Plan. The Settlement Capacity Study and subsequent Officer site visits have identified landscape capacity on this site for housing development. As such the Green Wedge status is not proposed for retention within</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>the Deposit Local Development Plan. A Site Assessment for the proposal for the site to be retained as a Green Wedge is included in the New and Amended Sites Table under Site No. 303.</p> <p>The claim of a detrimental impact upon tourism in the area has not been substantiated with evidence for consideration. The Authority considers that, on landscape grounds alone, the site has capacity for up to 20 units without causing an unacceptable detrimental impact upon the character of the area and surrounding landscape.</p>
4564 Mr BJ and Mrs FE Pritchard	Dinas Cross	124 – East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site’s development. Electronic Repls\4564Pritchard.pdf	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The existing Green Wedge designation is also included in the review process of the replacement Local Development Plan. The Settlement Capacity Study and subsequent Officer site visits have identified landscape capacity on this site for housing development. As such the Green Wedge status is not proposed for retention within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan. A Site Assessment for the proposal for the site to be retained as a Green Wedge is included in the New and Amended Sites Table under Site No. 303.</p>
4546 Louise Homer	Dinas Cross	124 – East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site’s development Electronic Reps\4546Homer.pdf	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>Cross within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>The existing Green Wedge designation is also included in the review process of the replacement Local Development Plan. The Settlement Capacity Study and subsequent Officer site visits have identified landscape capacity on this site for housing development. As such the Green Wedge status is not proposed for retention within the Deposit Local Development Plan. A Site Assessment for the proposal for the site to be retained as a Green Wedge is included in the New and Amended Sites Table under Site No. 303.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
4575 Chris Lodge on behalf of Tim and Jane Porch Brian and Fran Pritchard Richard and Angie Hughes Paul and Debbie Young Ros Holmes Judith Lodge Kate Flinn Nick Dovey John and Beverley Collins Richard Morris David Morgan Alan and Jo Senior	Dinas Cross	124 – East of Tower Hill	Objection to the site’s development Electronic Reprs\4575CLC.pdf	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the Centre boundary for Dinas Cross within the Deposit Local Development Plan. The comments made and their supporting information are noted. The Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register) has been updated in light of comments received and the findings of the Land Implementation Study.</p> <p>Whilst there is no need for additional market housing per se, there is an identified need for affordable housing and a lack of publicly available funds requires affordable housing provision to be cross-subsidised by market housing in accordance with national planning policy.</p> <p>The Settlement Capacity Study and subsequent Officer site</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				visits have identified landscape capacity on this site for housing development of up to 20 units, without causing an unacceptable detrimental impact upon the existing character of the surrounding landscape. Whilst this site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the revised Centre boundary, this view remains unchanged in the updated Site Assessment.
3617 The Coal Authority (M Lindsley)	General	General	No amendment needed	Noted
2910 St Davids City Council	General	General	No amendment needed.	Noted
833 Mr F Harbud	Martletwy	44 – Broad Lane, Lawrenny 45 – Home Farm, Lawrenny	I should advise you of my qualifications in making the following comments on the above. For seven years I was Chairman of a group of five Parish Councils in Staffordshire which was successful in representing the area in respect of a major application by the National Coal Board	The outcome of the Candidate Site assessment has concluded that only a small area of site 44 would be appropriate for development. Development of the whole site would extend development into the countryside.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>(NCB) for a “Super Pit” The Park Project, affecting not only a large swathe of rural area but also the County Town of Stafford. I am also a retired Councillor from the Martletwy Community Council.</p> <p>My comments on LDP (2) are as follows:-</p> <p>1] The addition of the green field opposite the sports field to the original site area is [a] An intrusion into the visual landscape from this well known playing field. [b] Extending the existing village envelope to where the proposed development will overwhelm the existing “unique” traditional village.</p> <p>2] The footpath planned to cross the field mentioned in [1] above is not necessary, as pedestrians from any future development can walk along the existing quiet country lane like everybody else in the village, or on the enlarged road to the development site where an entrance to the sports field and club exist.</p> <p>3] The proposed 30 houses plus 7 workshops are of a density more suitable</p>	<p>All sites have been considered at an initial density of 30 units per hectare. Detailed matters of layout, scale, access and other site features would be fully considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The covenant is not an absolute constraint on development. It is a matter for the National Trust to comment on any proposals coming forward.</p> <p>The Authority would consult Natural Resources Wales and Dwr Cymru on the availability and suitability of drainage and sewage systems and their capacity to accommodate new development. The cost of providing, maintaining or improving the existing private system is a private matter for the landowner.</p> <p>Recommend no change to the</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>for an urban environment.</p> <p>4] “ECO” houses proposed do not comply with the onerous conditions imposed on the design of dwellings under a covenant drawn by the National Trust since 1974 on all new buildings in the village.</p> <p>Lawrenny deed of covenant - salient points Dated - 22.2 1974 Between - D Lort-Phillips & National Trust Fee payable - £18,055 by NT Period of restriction - Permanent Restrictions & Stipulations – 1] Nothing permitted to alter appearance of amenities & appearance in general. 2] All building & development of village subject to NT approval. 3] Colour & external treatment of buildings subject to NT approval. [includes detail of windows, chimneys etc.] 4] No mine or quarry allowed except with NT approval [5] No healthy trees [timber] may be lopped, felled or removed unless approved by NT. Note - Includes trees on site of new farm building. What about those felled for bio</p>	<p>site assessments of sites 044 and 045 as a result of these comments.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>fuel?</p> <p>5] Sewage is a matter for the Environmental Agency, but it is the intention of the Lawrenny Estates Ltd to levey costs of any extension to the existing systems against the existing inhabitants. This is unfair. These costs should be charged to the cost of the new development[s].</p>	
<p>4460 Trustees of Robert Lock Trust (via Agent Barton Willmore)</p>	<p>Manorbier</p>	<p>078 Land to the West of B4585 Manorbier</p>	<p>4460LockTrustPDF</p>	<p>The initial assessment of this site concluded that development in this location would result in a detached group of houses and encroachment into the countryside. It was recommended that use of the site for housing would not be compliant with the Preferred Strategy. There is no further information contained in this submission to alter the original assessment of the site. The applicant/agent has referred to other 'potential sites' in the locality, however none of the sites were submitted as</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				Candidate Sites.
4446 Messrs Lort-Phillips (Atriarc)	Martletwy	043 Land adjacent to Bank Cottages, Lawrenny	Review of the Candidate Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. 4446LortPhillips043.pdf	This is a small plot with tree cover which also provides a strong boundary to Lawrenny. The size of the area between the road and the sports field would create a very cramped layout within the site as well as impacting on the trees which are a strong local feature. Recommend no change to the site assessment.
4446 Messrs Lort-Phillips (Atriarc)	Martletwy	044 Broad Lane, Lawrenny	Review of the Candidate Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. 4446LortPhillips044.pdf	The landowner has commented that use of a small parcel of the site, as concluded in the Candidate Site Assessment would not be acceptable without commercial benefit. The preference is to develop the whole of this site and the adjoining site 045 which is allocated in the current Plan. Further research prepared for the Revised Plan indicates that development of site 045, including the provision of affordable housing would not be

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>viable. As the strategy of the Plan is to provide for affordable housing (allowing market housing, where necessary for cross-subsidy) it would appear that development of even part of this site is unlikely to be forthcoming. In addition, the Welsh Government has raised concern about allocations being made in locations with no public transport access, such as Lawrenny.</p> <p>Given the comments submitted here it is recommended that the outcome of the Candidate Site Assessment be amended to reflect this position of the site not being compliant with the Preferred Strategy.</p>
4446 Messrs Lort-Phillips (Atriarc)	Martletwy	045 Home Farm Lawrenny	<p>Review of the Candidate Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. 4446LortPhillips045.pdf</p>	<p>The Plan Strategy is to provide for new affordable housing. Housing already let within the village by the landowner would not count towards new provision – for which there is an identified need. Allocation of sites for housing will need to</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>demonstrate that provision of affordable housing within the site is viable. A Land Implementation Study undertaken as part of the Plan preparation process shows that development of the site, even with a 5% affordable housing contribution is not viable.</p> <p>It is agreed that the response to question 3 of the assessment should be coloured green to correct an error. The wording remains as 'no'.</p> <p>The response to question 9 can be updated to reflect the latest position regarding farm relocation.</p> <p>Provision of public transport as a result of developments in the village is far from certain. It is highly unlikely that the public sector will made additional provision of services in the foreseeable future. The Welsh</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>Government has expressed concern about allocating land for development in location without public transport access.</p> <p>The comments submitted about the private drainage are agreed and the assessment will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the further viability assessment of the site and comments from Welsh Government about the lack of public transport access, it is recommended that the site assessment be updated to reflect that it is not compatible with the Strategy of the Plan.</p>
4446 Messrs Lort-Phillips (Atriarc)	Martletwy	046 Former Mansion Site, Lawrenny	Review of the Candidate Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. 4446LortPhillips046.pdf 4446LortPhillips046-2.pdf	Details of events held at the site and the potential to use the site for various purposes is contained in this submission. There is insufficient detail however to support allocation of the site.
4432 Mr S Oates	Martletwy	Part of Lawrenny 044	Objection to the site's development 4432OatesSiteandRep.pdf	This submission is an objection to the development of the site.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
		Home Farm		<p>Further research prepared for the Revised Plan indicates that development of site 045, including the provision of affordable housing would not be viable. As the strategy of the Plan is to provide for affordable housing (allowing market housing, where necessary for cross-subsidy) it would appear that development of even part of this site is unlikely to be forthcoming. In addition, the Welsh Government has raised concern about allocations being made in location with no public transport access, such as Lawrenny.</p> <p>Development of this site would not comply with the Preferred Strategy of the Plan.</p>
4432 Mr S Oates	Martletwy	Part of Lawrenny 044A Home Farm	Objection to the site's development 4432OatesSiteandRep.pdf	<p>This submission is an objection to the development of the site. Further research prepared for the Revised Plan indicates that development of site 045, including the provision of affordable housing would not be</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>viable. As the strategy of the Plan is to provide for affordable housing (allowing market housing, where necessary for cross-subsidy) it would appear that development of even part of this site is unlikely to be forthcoming. In addition, the Welsh Government has raised concern about allocations being made in location with no public transport access, such as Lawrenny.</p> <p>Development of this site would not comply with the Preferred Strategy of the Plan.</p>
4432 Mr S Oates	Martletwy	045 Lawrenny Home Farm	<p>Objection to the site's development 4432OatesSiteandRep.pdf</p>	<p>This submission is an objection to the development of the site. The Plan Strategy is to provide for new affordable housing. Allocation of sites for housing need to demonstrate that provision of affordable housing within the site is viable. A Land Implementation Study undertaken as part of the Plan preparation process shows that development of the site, even</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>with a 5% affordable housing contribution is not viable.</p> <p>The Welsh Government has expressed concern about allocating land for development in location without public transport access.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the further viability assessment of the site and comments from Welsh Government about the lack of public transport access, it is recommended that the site assessment be updated to reflect that it is not compatible with the Strategy of the Plan.</p>
4432 Mr S Oates	Martletwy	046 Former Mansion Site, Lawrenny	Objection to the site's development 4432OatesSiteandRep.pdf	This submission is an objection to the development of the site. Insufficient detail has been provided to allocate the site in the Replacement Local Development Plan.
4556 D & M Williams	Martletwy	Part of Lawrenny 044 Home Farm	Objection to the site's development. 4556Williams.pdf	This submission is an objection to the development of the site. Further research prepared for the Revised Plan indicates that

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>development of site 045, including the provision of affordable housing would not be viable. As the strategy of the Plan is to provide for affordable housing (allowing market housing, where necessary for cross-subsidy) it would appear that development of even part of this site is unlikely to be forthcoming. In addition, the Welsh Government has raised concern about allocations being made in location with no public transport access, such as Lawrenny. Development of this site would not comply with the Preferred Strategy of the Plan.</p>
4556 D & M Williams	Martletwy	Part of Lawrenny 044A Home Farm	<p>Objection to the site's development. 4556Williams.pdf</p>	<p>This submission is an objection to the development of the site. Further research prepared for the Revised Plan indicates that development of site 045, including the provision of affordable housing would not be viable. As the strategy of the Plan is to provide for affordable</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>housing (allowing market housing, where necessary for cross-subsidy) it would appear that development of even part of this site is unlikely to be forthcoming. In addition, the Welsh Government has raised concern about allocations being made in location with no public transport access, such as Lawrenny.</p> <p>Development of this site would not comply with the Preferred Strategy of the Plan.</p>
<p>4556 D & M Williams</p>	<p>Martletwy</p>	<p>045 Lawrenny Home Farm</p>	<p>Objection to the site’s development. 4556Williams.pdf</p>	<p>This submission is an objection to the development of the site. The Plan Strategy is to provide for new affordable housing. Allocation of sites for housing need to demonstrate that provision of affordable housing within the site is viable. A Land Implementation Study undertaken as part of the Plan preparation process shows that development of the site, even with a 5% affordable housing contribution is not viable.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>The Welsh Government has expressed concern about allocating land for development in location without public transport access.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the further viability assessment of the site and comments from Welsh Government about the lack of public transport access, it is recommended that the site assessment be updated to reflect that it is not compatible with the Strategy of the Plan.</p>
4556 D & M Williams	Martletwy	046 Former Mansion Site, Lawrenny	Objection to the site's development. 4556Williams.pdf	This submission is an objection to the development of the site. Insufficient detail has been provided to allocate the site in the Replacement Local Development Plan.
4589 Ms H Manley Jones	Newport	070 Opposite Newport Playing Fields, Newport	Keep this site as a green field. No development please. 4589ManleyJonesSite.pdf	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the revised Centre boundary for Newport within the Deposit Local Development Plan due to deliverability uncertainties. The

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>site would adjoin the Centre boundary along its southern boundary. New community facilities adjacent to existing Centre boundaries can be considered acceptable in principle under the policies of the draft Deposit plan, subject to the consideration of detailed material planning considerations at planning application stage. The concerns raised in relation to the impact upon the Conservation Area, Nevern Estuary, adjacent school and playing fields and the tranquillity of the lane would all form valid material considerations in this respect, which may override the benefits of such a proposal, should a planning application be submitted.</p>
<p>4447 Mr J Dyer (Harries Planning Design Management)</p>	<p>Newport</p>	<p>048 Land off Feidr Bentick</p>	<p>Reconsider this site. Information provided. 4447JohnDyer.pdf</p>	<p>Additional information has been submitted for a proposed vehicular access onto the A487. The Trunk Road Agency has been consulted and has subsequently advised that</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>further detailed plans would be required before a definitive view on the acceptability of a new access can be provided.</p> <p>The Site Assessment has been updated accordingly; however the conclusion that the site is unacceptable due to the landscape impact of creating a new access of Feidr Bentick, in the absence of a viable option from the A487, remains the same. Further information and subsequent consultation with the Trunk Roads Agency is required before this view can change.</p> <p>The view that there is a lack of available sites elsewhere in Newport would not override fundamental highway safety or landscape concerns for this site.</p>
4475 Mr and Mrs WGR Jones	Newport	070 Opposite Newport Playing Fields, Newport	We wish to object to the proposals currently being considered for submission by the Newport Town Council of a number of sites in Newport to be considered for	This site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the revised Centre boundary for Newport within the draft Deposit

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>development as car parks. The particular site we have in mind is the neighbouring field to Ywe strad Fflur bearing Ordnance Survey Number 7348 in Long Street, Newport and submit the attached in support of our objection.</p> <p>The whole of Long Street is understood to have burgage plots along its length.</p> <p>It is viewable from the north and east from the other side of the Nevern Estuary and has been protected from development over the years. The nearby Newport Caravan site was reduced in size and caravans withdrawn from the lower fields which run down to the Coast Path at the request of the National Park Authority many years ago to protect the view from the estuary. The current proposal would fly in the face of this established policy and be a slap in the face of the caravan site owners who sacrificed a considerable commercial area of their site to be cooperative with the National Park Authority. The site under consideration occupies a similar position vis a vis the views across the estuary and could encourage other applications to</p>	<p>Local Development Plan due to deliverability uncertainties. The site would adjoin the Centre boundary along its southern boundary. New community facilities adjacent to existing Centre boundaries can be considered acceptable in principle under the policies of the draft Deposit plan, subject to the consideration of detailed material planning considerations at planning application stage. The concerns raised in relation to the landscape impact, contamination and highway safety would all form valid material considerations in this respect, which may override the benefits of such a proposal, should a planning application be submitted.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>develop along the Coast Path between the bottom of Long Street and The Parrog.</p> <p>There is always a contaminated run off of rain water from car parks.</p> <p>Any increase in traffic along this length of Long Street would add to the problems already experienced by users of the Primary School on a daily basis and would negate safety measures recently taken to provide a speed bump, flashing lights and a defined pedestrian walkway to protect schoolchildren and their parents.</p>	
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	048 Land off Feidr Bentick, Newport	<p>I consider that the following proposals sacrifice fields which currently contribute to the beauty of the Newport environment and should not be used for housing:</p> <p>048 049 051 066 069 072 096 100 141</p>	<p>The comments are noted. The Authority considers that development would cause an unacceptable landscape impact on all the sites listed, except for the following:</p> <p>The Authority considers that a section of site 096 (see map 096A on the Candidate Site Register) would be acceptable for development on landscape impact grounds, although this site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				revised Centre boundary for other reasons (see the Site Assessment on the Candidate Site Register. Site 141 is an existing allocation with a valid planning permission for residential development. The Authority considers the landscape impact of residential development to be acceptable on this site.
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	049 Land off Ffordd Bedd Morris.. Newport	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	051 Land east of Treffynon... Newport	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	066 Land at Feidr Bentick, Newport	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	069 Land north of Tir Treharn, Newport	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	072 Land off Ffordd Bedd Morris..	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
		Newport		
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	096 Cippin Stone, Newport	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	100 Cotham Fields..Newport	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.
4540 Richard Hughes	Newport	141 North of Feidr Eglwys Newport	See above for Site 048.	See above response for site 048 Land off Feidr Bentick.
4543 Mrs M Owen	Newport	057 Parc y Plant, Newport	<p>I attended the meeting at Newport Memorial Hall last Thursday evening, and am concerned re one of the sites earmarked for development.</p> <p>My late husband’s family were from Newport and lived there all their lives. My parents-in-law farmed a small-holding called Dolwerdd, Long Street until 1947, when they moved to Cnwce, Fishguard Road, Newport.</p> <p>When the war ended in 1945 my father-in-law gave one of the fields at Dolwerdd to the town as a playing field for the children of the town, stipulating that this land should never be developed. I have a</p>	<p>It is proposed to retain this site as designated Open Space within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan and not allocate it for housing.</p> <p>A covenant agreement exists for the Town Council (the owners) to maintain the site for use only as a playing field for the benefit of the community, the agreement is dated 27th July 1994.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>feeling that this was the site referred to as Parc y Plant.</p> <p>Please will you look into this and advise me.</p>	
4553 Mrs V Williams	Newport	096A Cippin Stone, Newport	<p>The northern section adjacent to properties Tre cregyn, Kenvor, Manora and Y Gamfa Garreg is not part of the campsite (see additional sheet attached).</p> <p>In 1991 the field was purchased from Mr & Mrs Emrys Harries by a Trust formed by the owners of Tre cregyn, Kenvor, Manora and Y Gamfa Garreg to give them access to the rear of their properties and to preserve their privacy from any possible changes of use by the farmer. Shortly after the purchase Mr Harries opened a campsite on the part of the field he retained. The Trust have planted trees and hedges along their boundaries.</p>	In light of the separate ownership of an existing potential access point, the significant concerns over the feasibility of obtaining suitable access elsewhere into the site and the lack of further submitted information to alleviate these concerns, this site is not proposed for allocation or inclusion within the revised Centre boundary in the Deposit Local Development Plan. The Site Assessment has been updated accordingly (see the Candidate Site Register).
3686 Matthew Baker Caravans Ltd (Geraint John Planning)	Newport	069 Land North of Tir Treharne	<p>Object to the sites development.</p> <p>3686MatthewBakerCaravans.pdf</p> <p>.</p>	Comments are noted. The representor agrees with the Authority's assessment that development of the site would cause an unacceptable detrimental impact upon the landscape character of the area

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				(see the Site Assessment in the Candidate Site Register).
4571 Mr Evans	Newport	069 Land North of Tir Treharne	<p>I believe that the allocation of Site Number 069 (Land north of Tir Treharne, Newport) for housing development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape as it would encroach into an area of open fields and destroy the rural nature and quality of this part of Newport. It would have a serious adverse effect on the visual aspect viewed from Feidr Ganol, the Afon Nyfer Estuary and the Coast Path. The site is off Feidr Ganol which is a narrow lane with mature hedgerows giving it an attractive rural character. Any development would result in some considerable loss of this hedgerow, which would damage irreversibly the character of the lane. It would also increase the motor traffic on Feidr Ganol which already causes problems for pedestrians, being a popular walking route.</p> <p>Furthermore if housing development were to be allowed on this site, which is outside the Newport Settlement area, then it would be difficult to resist further development on adjoining fields north of Feidr Ganol. This would completely destroy the open</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation in the Deposit Local Development Plan and is not included within the revised Centre boundary for Newport. The Site Assessment conducted by the Authority agrees that the site would be unsuitable on landscape impact grounds.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			character landscape of the area and create a linear development along the lane. Therefore we agree with the Site Assessment’s conclusions that the site is not compliant with the draft Preferred Strategy and this site should not be allocated for housing development.	
3284 Mr & Mrs Merriman	Saundersfoot	015 Sandyhill, Saundersfoot	<p>Following on from the recent feedback as part of the Candidate Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal conducted by the LPA, we would like to provide the following additional comments/ points of clarification in respect of the proposed Sandy Hill site adjacent to Saundersfoot to address the queries raised.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email. For any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me on the below details.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you. 3284MerrimanRep.pdf</p>	<p>The additional information provided has helped to demonstrate the landowner’s intent to bring the site forward for development. An initial viability assessment shows that the site could accommodate the required level of affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Recommend that the conclusion to the site assessment is amended to show it would be compatible with the strategy of the Deposit Plan.</p>
3284 Mr & Mrs Merriman	Saundersfoot	016 Brooklands, Saundersfoot	Following further review, on behalf of Mr and Mrs Merriman, we would like to withdraw the current site references submissions 16 and 17, Land Adjacent to	Noted. These sites will not be progressed further.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>Brooklands reference - Site 17 (Chalet/ tourism use) - Site 16 (residential Use)</p> <p>We are withdrawing the sites at this stage from the candidate site process (for further review for either a tourism or future residential use to consider wider longer term development options)</p> <p>If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
3284 Mr & Mrs Merriman	Saundersfoot	017 Brooklands, Saundersfoot	<p>Following further review, on behalf of Mr and Mrs Merriman, we would like to withdraw the current site references submissions 16 and 17, Land Adjacent to Brooklands reference - Site 17 (Chalet/ tourism use) - Site 16 (residential Use)</p> <p>We are withdrawing the sites at this stage from the candidate site process (for further review for either a tourism or future residential use to consider wider longer term development options)</p> <p>If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	Noted. These sites will not be progressed further.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
2874 Brawdy Community Council	Solva	111 Land adjacent to Bro Dawel, Solva	<p>The above report was recently received, and discussed in our monthly meeting. Some concern was raised at item ref no. HA384 Adj Bro Dawel Solva. Our councillors were concerned that this development is to continue, as a residential development, when there is another site in the locality, which would surely be better suited to develop first.</p> <p>The football field at BroDawel is an essential village need, and any development in this area, would increase the traffic congestion, in this already busy area.</p> <p>We have asked our county councillor to liaise with the community council at Solva, to consider this matter further.</p> <p>We would welcome your comments on this case.</p>	<p>This site is not proposed for allocation in the Deposit Local Development Plan and is not included within the revised Centre boundary for Solva, the site may however be considered as an exception site for affordable housing provision, should such a planning application be submitted. The County Council committed to Solva Community Council in January 2000 that it would not allow this site to be developed without arrangements being in place for the provision of recreational facilities.</p> <p>With regard to comments relating to increased traffic congestion, this site is currently allocated within the Local Development Plan (HA384). The impacts in this regard are considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to detailed consideration at application stage.</p>
2397 Mr C	Solva	026, North of	I refer to the above. Further to my e-mail	The comments are noted. The

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
Davies (via Agent Llyr Evans Planning)		Maes y Forwen, Solva	<p>earlier today, please find attached a further response, updating a couple of points. Please supersede the previous e-mail with this one.</p> <p>Thank you for the notification in relation to the candidate sites assessment and for the opportunity to comment. Having considered the assessment information, Mr and Mrs Davies, would like to provide the following comments:</p> <p>Visual Assessment The site is located immediately adjoining the existing settlement boundary and built form of Solva. The built form of residential development is located directly to the south and the residential estate of Ynys Dawel to the west, extends further north than the proposed site. The development would therefore not extend beyond the 'northern building line' of the settlement and it is not considered that the development would appear as an obtrusive addition to the settlement when viewed from long distance views from the south, as referred to in the assessment.</p>	<p>Authority maintains the view that the site would cause an unacceptable detrimental impact upon the landscape character of the area as outlined in the Site Assessment (see Candidate Site Register). The Authority does not agree that the site would round off or rationalise the existing Centre boundary, but represent a clear extension into the countryside.</p> <p>The comments in relation to biodiversity improvement are noted.</p> <p>The feasibility and deliverability of the suggested improvements to the current sewage capacity issue in Solva have not been fully explored or evidenced. The Authority relies on the advice of its statutory consultee Dwr Cymru in this regard, which advises that the current sewage treatment works are already</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>The development would result in a small extension to the built form of the settlement along the Whitchurch road, but it would rationalise the field boundary directly to the north and appear as a logical, as opposed to visually intrusive part of the settlement. The proximity of the site to the settlement would also ensure that the site is functionally well-related to the settlement and its amenities.</p> <p>Whilst the land rises to the north, the development would not extend to the peak of this land form and it is not anticipated that the development would break the skyline when viewed from the south. The development could take place at a comparable level to the adjoining development at Maes Y Forwen and suitably designed, comparatively low, dwellings within the site would not appear intrusive within the landscape. Furthermore, a robust boundary hedge along the northern boundary of the site could be formed, providing a clear boundary to the settlement.</p> <p>In essence, the site would round-off and</p>	<p>overloaded with no timescale available for improvement.</p> <p>The Site Assessments for all sites in Solva highlight the sewage capacity issue as an infrastructural constraint and colour the relevant Question 9 as red (see Candidate Site Register). No allocations are proposed in Solva within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The viability information provided is noted; however this does not outweigh the above considerations.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>complete this element of the settlement, whilst being contained within the 'northern building line' established by the Ynys Dawel estate to the west. Furthermore, the development would not extend to the peak of the land-form to the north. The development would appear as a logical addition to Solva when viewed from the immediate proximity of the site, rationalising the boundary of the field enclosure by squaring it off and from more distant views, the development would appear subservient to the 'building line' established by the existing dwellings to the west.</p> <p>In light of the points discussed above, it is considered that the development would be compatible with the National Park Purposes and Duty and would not cause unacceptable detrimental impacts to the character of the settlement or wider area. It is therefore considered that criteria A, D and 27 of the PCNPA Site Assessment could therefore be rebalanced in favour of the development.</p> <p>Biodiversity</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>The field is currently cut a number of times a year, limiting opportunity for biodiversity habitats. Actively managing the site as part of a residential development and enhancing habitat opportunities through hedges, trees, ponds, etc. could enhance the ecological value of the land.</p> <p>Sewerage Capacity Mr and Mrs Davies have been aware of the sewerage capacity issues in Solva for a number of year and would like to provide the following comments:</p> <p>The restriction of the last few decades imposed by Dwr Cymru siting inadequate capacity at Gwaden works is not acceptable. It has effectively stopped all development in the village from taking place. They have an obligation under the Water Act to provide adequate capacity which is funded through infrastructure charges.</p> <p>Dwr Cymru has had sufficient time to address this lack of capacity in their capital programme and should have had an upgrade set into their last - let alone the</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>current or next AMP plan.</p> <p>One solution - if the problems at Gwaden are so great that there is no immediate possibility of the site being upgraded - is the construction of a new high tech works in the valley to the west of Llanunwas and to the south of Llanungar Fach camping site. The site could be on the old POW / ministry area with access from opposite 'snakey lane'.</p> <p>Any new development in Solva will most likely be concentrated in the upper part of the village, so with the construction of a new pumping station on part of the site of the old public toilets at Pwll Melyn - which is now used as a parking space,(below Mount Seion chapel), flows from properties in Maes Ewan, Whitchurch Road, Llanungar Lane, Bro Dawel, the new 'surgery' development, could be diverted to outfall into the new Pumping Station which would then have a rising main running west up the main road (or in verge, to a head manhole near the entrance to Llanunwas from whence gravity would take the flows to the new works in the adjacent</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>valley (plus the Llanunwas and Llanungar sites which would outfall direct to the new works). With the addition of an additional small P Stn Nine Wells and Broadlands could also be connected to a treated system, and another small P Stn could be provided to pump Bryn Seions flows to the new P Stn at Pwll Melyn, thus taking massive strain off the existing works</p> <p>This suggestion will free up capacity at the Gwaden works and reduce the number of pollution incidents and uncontrolled discharges of untreated sewerage into the River Solva and the River Gwaden, resulting in poor water quality in an area renowned for its "Blue Beaches". It will also allow much needed development of all types to be enabled in the upper part of the village as well as some limited redevelopment of the lower village.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the consideration of the drainage issues associated with the other candidate sites for Solva have not been assessed so negatively, being marked as yellow, as opposed to red. It is understood that the</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>same system accommodates the whole of Solva and therefore it is difficult to understand the differences in these assessments, e.g site 151.</p> <p>With regards to wider viability, please note that whilst off-site drainage connection and a possible footpath were included in the viability assessment as costs, the scheme was still viable after taking them into account.</p> <p>I trust the above will be considered in the assessment of the site.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if you require any further information.</p>	
2708 Mr R Smith, Pembrokeshire County Council	Solva	111 Bro Dawel, Solva (football pitch)	<p>PCC is not proposing to take forward a 100% affordable housing scheme on this site.</p> <p>It is currently being considered by an RSL and by PCC’s housing team.</p> <p>PCC is in the process of instructing an agent.</p> <p>It is hoped to secure planning consent for a housing scheme under the current Plan. Notwithstanding this, PCC wants the housing allocation to be retained in LDP 2.</p>	<p>The progress made on bringing this existing allocation forward for development is noted. However, to date no planning application or formal pre-application enquiry has been made. No additional evidence to demonstrate the site’s deliverability has been received, for example to address the sewage capacity issue in Solva.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			If PCNPA will only permit 100% affordable housing, it will not be possible to deliver the replacement football pitch.	The site is therefore not allocated for residential development within the Deposit Local Development Plan as the Authority cannot demonstrate confidence that the site will be developed within the replacement plan period.
1487 Pembrokeshire Housing (Geraint John Planning)	St Davids	099 Adjacent to Glasfryn Lane St Davids	It is proposed that the existing allocation HA737 (for 90 units) be reallocated. 1487PHA.pdf	Support is noted for the site, which is proposed as an allocation within the draft Deposit Local Development Plan.
1487 Pembrokeshire Housing (Geraint John Planning)	St Davids	021 Glasfryn lane, St Davids	It is proposed that the existing allocation HA737 (for 90 units) be reallocated. 1487PHA.pdf	Support is noted for the site, which is proposed as an allocation within the Deposit Local Development Plan.
4578 P & M Edey	St Davids	142 Adjacent Ysgol Bro Dewi), St Davids	Concerns outlined over the development of this site. 4578EdeyRep.pdf	The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms the existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape or amenity impact in principle, subject to detailed design

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>considerations. No new evidence or considerations have been submitted to change this view.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability concerns (see the Candidate Site Register). It is proposed to prioritise the existing allocation at Glasfryn Road (Site refs 021A and 099A). Any proposal as an exception site for affordable housing will be considered on its merits.</p>
4578 P & M Edey	St Davids	097 Land adjacent Ysgol Bro Dewi and East of Wyncliffe Cottage), St Davids	Concerns outlined over the development of this site. 4578EdeyRep.pdf	The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms part of an existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan plus a north western extension, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape impact in principle, subject to detailed design considerations. No new evidence or considerations have

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>been submitted to change this view.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability and access concerns (see the Candidate Site Register). It is proposed to prioritise the existing allocation at Glasfryn Road (Site refs 021A and 099A).</p>
4572 Nigel Stowe	St Davids	142 – Adjacent Ysgol Bro Dewi, St Davids	This should be kept as agricultural land not developed for housing. Intensifying housing in central St Davids increases traffic congestion and deteriorates the visual amenity for current residents. And this location is particularly appropriate on a one way street close to a school	<p>The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms the existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape or amenity impact in principle, subject to detailed design considerations (see the Candidate Site Register). No new evidence or considerations have been submitted to change this view.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability. Any proposal as an exception site for affordable housing will be considered on its merits</p> <p>The Highways Authority has not objected to the development of this site on traffic congestion or highway safety grounds.</p> <p>The site is not identified as the best and most versatile land. Its loss would not therefore warrant safeguarding.</p>
4573 John Jeremy	St Davids	142 – Adjacent Ysgol Bro Dewi, St Davids	Objection to the site’s development. 4573JeremyRep.pdf	The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms the existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape or amenity impact in principle, subject to detailed design considerations. No new evidence or considerations have

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>been submitted to change this view.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability and access concerns. It is proposed to prioritise the existing allocation at Glasfryn Road (Site refs 021A and 099A). Any proposal as an exception site for affordable housing will be considered on its merits.</p> <p>The impact of light pollution would be a detailed planning consideration at application stage and would vary according to the scheme proposed.</p> <p>No specific evidence is available to substantiate a perceived impact on neighbouring bed and breakfast business. This would not in itself be a valid material planning consideration.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>The Highways Authority has not objected to the development of this site on traffic congestion or highway safety grounds.</p> <p>Any proposed scheme would need to demonstrate an acceptable drainage scheme as part of any development.</p>
4574 Mr and Mrs JDA Wheatley	St Davids	142 – Adjacent Ysgol Bro Dewi, St Davids	Objection to the site’s development. 4574Wheatley.pdf	<p>The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms the existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape or amenity impact in principle, subject to detailed design considerations, including the impact on neighbouring listed buildings.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability and access concerns. It is proposed to prioritise the existing allocation at Glasfryn Road (Site refs 021A</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>and 099A). Any proposal as an exception site for affordable housing will be considered on its merits.</p> <p>The impact of light pollution would be a detailed planning consideration at application stage and would vary according to the scheme proposed.</p> <p>The Highways Authority has not objected to the development of this site on traffic congestion or highway safety grounds.</p> <p>The site has not been identified as an area of particular biodiversity importance however any proposed scheme would need to conduct the relevant ecological surveys and demonstrate adequate protection/mitigation towards any protected species on site.</p> <p>Dwr Cymru has advised that sewage capacity exists for the</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				current allocation. No new evidence is available to assess further.
4574 Mr and Mrs JDA Wheatley	St Davids	097 – Land adjacent Ysgol Bro Dewi and East of Wyncliffe Cottage, St Davids	Objection to the site’s development 4574Wheatley.pdf	<p>The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms part of the existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan, with additional land to the north west, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape or amenity impact in principle, subject to detailed design considerations, including the impact on neighbouring listed buildings.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability and access concerns. It is proposed to prioritise the existing allocation at Glasfryn Road (Site refs 021A and 099A).</p> <p>The impact of light pollution would be a detailed planning consideration at application</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>stage and would vary according to the scheme proposed.</p> <p>The impacts of traffic with regard to obtaining a suitable access point is raised as a concern in the Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register). No new evidence is available to assess further.</p> <p>The site has not been identified as an area of particular biodiversity importance however any proposed scheme would need to conduct the relevant ecological surveys and demonstrate adequate protection/mitigation towards any protected species on site.</p> <p>Dwr Cymru has advised that sewage capacity exists for the current allocation. No new evidence is available to assess further.</p>
3820 D Hoare	St Davids	142 Adjacent Ysgol Bro	Object to the sites development 3820Hoare.pdf	The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms the

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
		Dewi, St Davids		<p>existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape or amenity impact in principle, subject to detailed design considerations.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability and access concerns. It is proposed to prioritise the existing allocation at Glasfryn Road (Site refs 021A and 099A). Any proposal as an exception site for affordable housing will be considered on its merits.</p> <p>No specific evidence is available to substantiate a perceived impact on neighbouring bed and breakfast business. This would not in itself be a valid material planning consideration.</p> <p>The impact of light pollution</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>would be a detailed planning consideration at application stage and would vary according to the scheme proposed.</p> <p>The site has not been identified as an area of particular biodiversity importance however any proposed scheme would need to conduct the relevant ecological surveys and demonstrate adequate protection/mitigation towards any protected species on site.</p> <p>Dwr Cymru has advised that sewage capacity exists for the current allocation. No new evidence is available to assess further.</p> <p>With regard to the comments made in relation to sex offenders, this issue lies outside the scope of planning land use policy for generic market housing allocations. Should a specific proposal be received for</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				housing of this nature, the appropriateness of the location would form a material planning consideration.
3820 D Hoare	St Davids	097 Land adj to Ysgol Bro Dewi and East of Wyncliffe Cottage), St Davids	Object to the sites development 3820Hoare.pdf	<p>The Site Assessment considers that the site, which forms part of the existing allocation in the current Local Development Plan, with additional land to the north west, would not cause a significant detrimental landscape or amenity impact in principle, subject to detailed design considerations, including the impact on neighbouring listed buildings.</p> <p>The site is not proposed for re-allocation or inclusion within the centre boundary due to deliverability and access concerns. It is proposed to prioritise the existing allocation at Glasfryn Road (Site refs 021A and 099A).</p> <p>No specific evidence is available to substantiate a perceived</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>impact on neighbouring bed and breakfast business. This would not in itself be a valid material planning consideration.</p> <p>The impact of light pollution would be a detailed planning consideration at application stage and would vary according to the scheme proposed.</p> <p>The impacts of traffic with regard to obtaining a suitable access point is raised as a concern in the Site Assessment (see the Candidate Site Register). No new evidence is available to assess further.</p> <p>The site has not been identified as an area of particular biodiversity importance however any proposed scheme would need to conduct the relevant ecological surveys and demonstrate adequate protection/mitigation towards any protected species on site.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>Dwr Cymru has advised that sewage capacity exists for the current allocation. No new evidence is available to assess further.</p> <p>With regard to the comments made in relation to sex offenders, this issue lies outside the scope of planning land use policy for generic market housing allocations. Should a specific proposal be received for housing of this nature, the appropriateness of the location would form a material planning consideration.</p>
<p>4443 Mr Marshall (Acanthus Holden)</p>	<p>St Ishmaels</p>	<p>034 Land off Trewarren Road adjacent School, St Ishmaels</p>	<p>Site 034 Further viability information is now available.</p>	<p>The Land Implementation Study, for which the submitted information advises, indicates that this site would not be financially viable to develop. It is not therefore proposed for re-allocation in the draft Deposit Local Development Plan on deliverability grounds (see the Site Assessment within the</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
2708 Mr R Smith, Pembrokeshire County Council	Stackpole and Castlemartin	114 Stackpole School	<p>PCC has concerns regarding the NPA’s proposal for use of the school field for recreational purposes. Who is likely to take this area on for recreational use when the School closes?</p> <p>PCC would prefer at least part of this area to also come forward as an affordable housing exception site (100% affordable housing) with the residual land incorporated into the housing scheme as amenity land for the development. The playing field is currently a private facility for the use of the School and is not available as amenity / recreational land for the wider community.</p>	<p>Candidate Site Register).</p> <p>The list of rural centres has been reassessed since the Preferred Strategy. The same methodology has been used but the pending closure of Stackpole school in January 2018 reduces the number of services and facilities available in the village below the threshold required for it to be rural centre. Allocations are not made below the rural centre category. Infill and rounding-off opportunities will be considered. The Open Space background paper identifies a lack of pitch space and childrens’ play space in Stackpole and so any new housing developments would need to make provision, as required through Planning Obligations in terms of new need arising from the particular development. Whilst the school field is currently only used by the school, the addition of a playing field/playground to the</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				village would add to its sustainability and be a positive enhancement for the residents. When considering loss of community facilities the land would be firstly considered for another community facility, employment use or affordable housing will be prioritised. The availability of sewage capacity in Stackpole would be a constraint on the number of dwellings that could be permitted.
4568 Save Brynhir Green Space and Wildlife Group (R Nelson)	Tenby	112 Brynhir Tenby	Object to development of Brynhir Tenby. 4568NelsonGroup.pdf	Please see Appendix 1 for this response
4217 Mr G Fry	Tenby	005	I now ask is the marina I submitted included in the Local Development Plan? If not, why not?	Information on the Authority's assessment of the proposal as a Candidate Site has been sent to the objector. In summary the proposal has been considered as a

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>Candidate Site. It is a large-scale proposal without sufficient evidence to support its inclusion in the Local Development Plan. A marina development in Tenby would not meet the criteria set out in the Welsh Government's Coastal Tourism Strategy and would therefore not be backed by national planning policy. The full assessment can be found in the Candidate Sites Register.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change to assessment. The proposal is contrary to the Preferred Strategy.</p>
2916 Tenby Town Council	Tenby	General – Candidate Sites	<p>Tenby Town Council reserve the right to comment on Candidate sites and related figures at the Draft Deposit Stage. Members do feel, however, that Candidate sites should only be included if the affordable housing element is deliverable during the life of the LDP as members are concerned that sites are sometimes only included to meet targets (e.g. one site has been included in the LDP for over 30 years</p>	<p>Response noted.</p> <p>The intention with the Preferred Strategy seek to allocate sites that can deliver affordable housing.</p> <p>The issue of deliverability will be a key test for this replacement Local Development Plan.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			but no development has yet taken place).	
2708 Mr R Smith, Pembrokeshire County Council	Tenby	112 Brynhir, Tenby	PCC strongly disagrees with the statement that there is no strong commitment from the landowner (i.e. PCC) to bring the site forward for development. PCC has marketed the site via an agent. PCC is looking at alternative ways to develop this site. PCC wants the housing allocation to be retained in LDP 2.	An initial viability assessment shows that the site could accommodate the required level of affordable housing provision. Further information is required from the landowner to demonstrate an intention to bring the site forward for development within the Plan period. Despite being allocated for residential development since the mid 1990's, no planning application nor pre-application enquiry has been made to develop any or part of the site.
2708 Mr R Smith, Pembrokeshire County Council	Tenby	113 Butts Field, Tenby	PCC agrees that it has previously advised that it is not intending to bring this site forward for housing purposes, due to the displacement of parking that would result from this. However, PCC is exploring mixed use opportunities for this site.	This is a brownfield site within Tenby. There is insufficient information to allocate the site for any specific use. Proposals emerging after Plan adoption will be considered against its generic policies. Recommend that the land is not

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
4428 Mr P Evenden	Tenby	Site 001 Francis Yard, Tenby	<p>I have been abroad for a while and have only opened your letter regarding Francis Yard today.</p> <p>I recently had some discussions with Pembrokeshire Housing regarding a possible redevelopment of the site for affordable units, I must confess that I was surprised as to the level of monetary sacrifice on my part that they were expecting!</p> <p>Although I have quite a few properties in Tenby I worked very hard (and took significant financial risks in some cases) to buy all of them, unlike some notable local property owners I did not 'inherit them on a plate for nothing' then let them fall into wrack and ruin before finally redeveloping them !</p> <p>Consequently although I am quite altruistic in nature and regularly give to those less fortunate, I feel that in this case my primary duty is to my children and grandchildren etc rather than subsidising a quango that is grant funded anyway.</p> <p>They value the site as if it were a similarly</p>	<p>allocated in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>Noted. The site is within the centre of Tenby and suitable, in principle, for redevelopment. It would not be allocated without support from the landowner and commitment to it being developed within the Plan period. No further assessment of this site will be made.</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>sized brownfield site on the outskirts of one of our more economically depressed county towns, making no allowance for the fact that it is just outside the town walls of Tenby and currently successfully utilised !</p> <p>At present the site is used for lock up garages and parking, there are 39 lock ups on the site and around 49 parking spaces.</p> <p>I have had valuations from local estate agents that suggest that good quality lock up garages in Tenby could be sold for up to £25,000 each and parking spaces for up to £15,000 each. At present all the units are rented out and although some could do with improvement to achieve the above figures the rental income is still very significant.</p> <p>These figures (even if very optimistic) make a mockery of Pembrokeshire housings valuation.</p> <p>Even if the site were to be developed for open market housing the present 35% affordable requirement makes redeveloping the site unattractive.</p>	

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			<p>In light of the above I intend to continue with the sites current use as parking and lock up garages for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>It may be that one day policies change and we can revisit this but currently the figures are so far apart I doubt it.</p>	
<p>4460 Trustees of Robert Lock Trust (via Agent Barton Willmore)</p>	<p>Tenby</p>	<p>079 Land East of Old Narberth Rd Tenby</p>	<p>4460RoberLockTrustTenby</p>	<p>Old Narberth Road is referred to on the map base used by the Authority as Slippery Back and it is the length of road from the A478 to the site referred to in the assessment. Pembrokeshire County Council Highway Authority was consulted on the original Candidate Site submission and the advice given is included in the appraisal. Whilst the location of the site at the edge of Tenby and the links to the town via Slippery Back cycle path provide an excellent opportunity to help minimise car use, a realistic approach needs to be taken with regard to car ownership and for access for</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				other means such as deliveries, emergency services etc. Recommend no change to the assessment of this site.
3511 Tenby Civic Society (H Gardiner)	Tenby	112 Brynhir Tenby	3511TenbyCivicSociety	<p>The green wedge to the north of Tenby is designated to control further development in this area, although a green wedge designation does not preclude all new development. Work would be required to upgrade the access road through the green wedge to the Bryn Hir site, but it will also provide additional protection to the land surrounding the road from further encroachment.</p> <p>The comments relating to the wooded area are noted and will be taken into consideration through the ongoing process of site assessment. The scheduled ancient monument to the north of the site known. Dyfed Archaeology has been consulted about the allocated site and advised on protection of the monument. Its presence,</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				<p>however does not preclude the development of the site. Use of the land for informal recreation is acknowledged. Any public rights of way will be retained. The value of the land for informal recreation has to be balanced against the need for housing provision to cater for identified need.</p>
1335 Birt & Co	Tenby	120 Upper Cwm Park, Tenby. Candidate Site Viability - Candidate	<p>I have had sight of your site assessment for the above field and note that you have made reference to the vehicular access to this site being via Slippery Back. Although this access can be used by pedestrians and cyclists to access the town centre directly, it is not the proposed vehicular access to this site, which would be along the Old Narberth Road. I consider the Old Narberth Road to be suitable for accessing a residential development at Upper Cwm Park.</p> <p>I would be grateful if this comment could be put before the Committee considering this Candidate Site.</p> <p>If you require any further information</p>	<p>Old Narberth Road is referred to on the map base used by the Authority as Slippery Back and it is the length of road from the A478 to the site referred to in the assessment. Pembrokeshire County Council Highway Authority were consulted on the original Candidate Site submission and the advice given is included in the appraisal. Whilst the location of the site at the edge of Tenby and the links to the town via Slippery Back cycle path provide an excellent opportunity to help minimise car use, a realistic approach needs to be</p>

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
			please do not hesitate to contact me.	taken with regard to car ownership and for access for other means such as deliveries, emergency services etc.
4583 Mr G Elmes	The Havens	027 Penberry, Little Haven	I concur with the views expressed in the Candidate Site Assessment and the Detailed Site Appraisal.	Noted.
4436 Mr R Sutherland (Acanthus Holden)	The Havens	018Land opposite Heddfan, Little Haven	Site 018 The site is <u>not</u> a tree covered slope or wooded land as described. Please also refer to attached letter with other comments 4436Sutherland.pdf	Photographs taken by the Authority and publicly available aerial photographs show the land to be covered by trees. It is also steeply sloping land extending from the car park on the valley floor at Little Haven to Blockett Lane. The site has recently been severed by an unauthorised roadway leading to a caravan at the neighbouring property. A retrospective application for the road has been refused by the Authority for its impact on the character of the National Park and the Conservation Area and highway safety. A housing development at this location would have a similar or greater impact. No

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
				change to the assessment is recommended.
3251 Dr & Mrs Davies) Acanthus Holden	The Havens	027 Penberry, Little Haven	Site 027 The site’s status as part of a garden, curtilage of a dwelling is not mentioned. Please also refer to attached letter with other comments. 3251DaviesPenberry.pdf	Reference to the site being within the curtilage of an existing dwelling can be included within the assessment. The right of access across the neighbouring property has recently been considered by the Authority when an unauthorised roadway was created. A subsequent retrospective application for the works was refused. The refusal included the access being unsafe on highways grounds. The site is adjacent to a TAN15 Zone B flood risk zone as shown on the Natural Resources Wales Development Advice Map (2017). Whilst factual changes can be made to the assessment it does not alter the overall outcome that the site is not considered compatible with the Preferred Strategy of the Plan. Amendment done.

Representor – number and name	Community/ Town Council area	Commenting on Site Number and Location	Comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
3372 Raymond and Raymond (Paul Hales)	The Havens	040 Off Marine Road, Broad Haven	Site No. 040 on the candidate site assessment criterion D is considered to be incorrect in that satisfactory vehicular access to the site can be achieved. Detailed site appraisal comment 5 is considered to be incorrect in that Trafalgar Terrace is of a standard to cater for additional traffic movements.	The response included in the site assessment relating to the site access was provided by the Highway Authority. The comments here do not provide sufficient evidence to change the assessment.
4576 Waterstone Homes (Asbri Planning)	The Havens	073 East of Walton Road, Broad Haven	4576ABowenRep.pdf	This site extends well beyond the built area of Broad Haven and would breach the skyline in views from within the village. Development would constitute an incursion into the countryside. There are also concerns raised by the Highway Authority about the potential to create a pedestrian access from the site to the village. The allocation would not comply with the strategy of the Replacement Plan.

Appendix 1 – in Representor Number Order

4568 Save Brynhir Green Space and Wildlife Group (R Nelson)

Re: Public Consultation on Local Development Plan Preferred Strategy – Request to remove Brynhir site from the Local Development Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the “Preferred Strategy” section of the replacement Local Development Plan – end date 2031.

This is the authorised response on behalf of “Save Brynhir Green Space and Wildlife Group”. As you will be aware, this group was formed in protest to proposed development of the Brynhir area and is overseen by a Chair, Rebecca Nelson and a committee of committed local residents who are opposed to building on this site. In addition, over 1,000 supporters are members of a closed group on Facebook. The group’s aim is to persuade the Planning authority and the landowners (Pembrokeshire County Council) that this area should be removed from the Local Development Plan and not be built upon, thus protecting the local environment and wildlife.

The “Preferred Strategy” document is built upon newly gathered evidence in support of a vision for Tenby and we would argue that the Brynhir site does not have strategic fit with the vision for Tenby and surrounding areas from 2021-2031.

Our arguments against the inclusion of Brynhir in the next development plan are:

1. Unnecessary Over-development

This proposed site consists of a very large number of new houses, putting undue strain on local resources including health, police, social care and education services and strain on fragile infrastructure such as sewerage, drainage, water supplies. We are concerned that a flooding risk exists if this development were to go ahead. Added to this is an overwhelming burden on already congested roads and parking especially in the summer months.

The strategy illustrates that the population of Tenby is in decline, the current estimate of population is 4500, the population of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park is declining and assumptions within the development plan over 20 years ago when this site was first identified were that population would grow. Against a national backdrop of increasing populations, in the National Park area and also reflected in Tenby itself, since 2001 the population has declined by over 10%. The proposed housing development is currently assumed to be around 168 houses, this could mean around 600 more residents, which equates to increasing the local population by 13%. We argue that this is disproportionate and unnecessary. As readily admitted by the National Park in letters to the group there is no market demand for more houses and this is evidenced by the development of new executive homes on the opposite side of Narberth Road which have been reduced a number of times and are not selling. We could also point to various failing housing developments in the wider local area. To lose this beautiful area in order to build houses that are not needed and for which there is no economic case would be a tragedy indeed. We understand that the economic model for the development of affordable homes (for which there is demand) depends on market housing. This renders this plan unworkable.

2. Visual Impact

The group has been actively seeking support from like-minded bodies in the area who seek to maintain Tenby's unique character, in a meeting with the Civic Society, they share our view that this site is unsuitable for development because of the topography – the slope of the land means that it is readily seen from the coast, Caldey Island and from the estuary. They also raised their concerns about the relaxation of rules establishing a “green wedge” between Tenby and New Hedges. This is being slowly eroded by permission being given for other developments.

The group is also concerned about the visual impact of such a large housing estate on the main road into Tenby, changing the visual welcome to visitors to the town and potentially impacting on the local economy.

3. Environmental impacts

This area is habitat to many protected species. Regularly spotted are foxes, badgers, birds of prey, slow worms, toads, voles and other small mammals. It is a travesty that the National Park whose role it is to protect such heritage is prepared to develop this area. Although we recognise that it is the job of the National Park to balance

economic growth with environmental issues, new housing does not of itself bring economic prosperity. This is an important green space within a town with very little, losing it is unthinkable.

4. Economic aspects

Jobs in the area are largely low -paid seasonal jobs, many people working at 2 or 3 part time jobs in order to make ends meet, making house purchase an unattainable dream for many. Even affordable homes at 20% below market value is not affordable and will be sold as second homes, a large proportion of the housing stock in Tenby is not lived in all year round. It is counter-intuitive to build more houses when there is such under occupancy. Policy needs to be developed around securing low cost homes for local people when they come up for sale.

Tenby's future (as evidenced in the Preferred Strategy document) is largely dependent on tourism. Tourism depends on attractive venues and amenities. There are a number of camping and caravan sites in the area and people love to bring their dogs on this type of holiday. These holidaymakers need open space in which to exercise their dogs, at present they use the Brynhir fields extensively for this purpose, should this amenity be lost then dogs will be taken on the beaches (which have summer dog bans) and park areas in Tenby resulting in potential risks to public health. As being able to bring pets on holiday is a main reason for camping and caravanning holidays, on which Tenby has such dependence, holidaymakers will go to other places where their dogs are welcome losing this income from the local shops and businesses. Local residents also need open space in which to take their animals and the fields are used all year around.

It is argued by the council that the fields are development land previously let for agriculture and that people shouldn't be using these places for amenity, however the council has allowed the placing of seating near the footpath for people to sit when walking their dogs, thus reinforcing the impression of the area as amenity land. The group believe that the Brynhir site should be removed from the LDP and held in perpetuity as amenity land managed under agricultural tenancy as it was before the land was put up for sale.

Tourism depends on the favourable impression of visitors entering the town, as the Brynhir site adjoins the main road into the town, it will be very visible to people on the Narberth Rd and could also readily be seen from the coast

and Caldey Island. The additional huge increase in population will add to the road congestion which is already putting off visitors especially during the summer when parking is at a premium.

5. Feasibility

Previous criticism had been levelled at the National Park LDP by experts, doubting that the Brynhir site was suitable for inclusion in the plan because of the prohibitive costs of bringing the housing to fruition. Using the model of private development enabling affordable homes to be built does not work in a depressed housing market and is further complicated in this case by the need to build in expensive infrastructure in order to overcome the issues in point 1 above. There is no demand for more market property apart from as second homes. We would now argue that, as the Pembrokeshire County Council has been trying to negotiate the sale of the land for development since August 2015 and failed, this site has been thoroughly market tested. It is now time for the Planning Authority to remove this site from the LDP to be in place for 2021 and lift the damaging planning blight on existing homes in the area whose saleability and value are negatively impacted whilst there are so many unknowns about any potential development. It is argued that as development has not been feasible over the past 30 years or so the planning authority should revise its plans accordingly and cease to cite this area as a potential development site. Other smaller, brown field sites (perhaps not directly in Tenby) need to be found for social housing and affordable homes. There are numbers of empty homes in evidence in the area and the Council has powers to take these on and let them as social housing if they so wish, we would like to see these empty houses return to use as family homes within existing estates rather than build on a beautiful greenfield site. Numbers need to be revised downwards in light of the latest population decline and future trends. Tenby is unique and is the jewel in Wales's crown protected by National Park status, it is time for that protection to be exercised and small scale, creative solutions to be found if there is sufficient will for it to happen.

As a group we are more than willing to meet with any representative of the Planning Authority and discuss these matters further.

Signed : The Chair and Committee of the Save Brynhir Green Space and Wildlife Group

Officer Response

The site was first included in an adopted development plan in the mid-1990s. Since then the allocation has been reviewed several times for inclusion in subsequent development plans. On each occasion the Authority has consulted all relevant authorities and bodies to ensure the satisfactory development of the land. This includes liaison with Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water and Natural Resources Wales with specific reference to sewerage, drainage, water supplies and flooding. No objections have been raised.

Whilst there is no need for additional market housing per se, there is an identified need for affordable housing and a lack of publicly available funds requires affordable housing provision to be cross-subsidised by market housing.

Based on the 2011 average household size figures for Pembrokeshire, a development of 168 houses would house 370 people. Whilst it is inevitable this will include people moving to Tenby, some of the demand, particularly for the affordable housing will arise from existing residents within the town.

Whilst the site is visible from various locations – including the coast and Caldey Island it is seen within the context of the rest of Tenby town and is contained between Lady Park/Hill Park to the west and the group of houses at Old Narberth Road. Whilst the improvements to the access road would be visible from the A478 the site is screened by the topography of the land.

Use of the land for informal recreation is acknowledged. Any public rights of way will be retained. The value of the land for informal recreation has to be balanced against the need for housing provision to cater for identified need.

The Authority commissioned a study of the viability of candidate sites to be undertaken to help create certainty about delivery of housing, and in particular affordable housing. Whilst the conclusions of the study show that development of the site for market and affordable housing would be viable, the landowner has not demonstrated a strong commitment to bringing the site forward for development to date and deliverability is uncertain. The site is considerably larger than any other allocated site in the current Local Development Plan and the number of units it can accommodate would be a significant proportion of the land supply for the National Park. The lack of security of its deliverability would undermine the strategy of the Replacement Local Development Plan. The site is not proposed for inclusion.