

## **CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATION**

### **HEARING SESSION 8: EMPLOYMENT AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT MATTERS - SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT**

**Prepared by Boyer Planning on Behalf of R.E Phillips and Partners  
In respect of South Extension, Penyfan 2049.D14**

This statement is supplementary to Hearing Session 8 conducted on the 20<sup>th</sup> May 2010 concerning Employment and Commercial Development Matters at which the southern extension of Pen-y-Fan Industrial Estate was considered (2049.D14).

During the Hearing Session the Local Authority's representative introduced an argument based on the need to allocate the site for employment having changed since the Deposit Plan and that this justified its deletion in the Focused Changes. Such an argument is not recited in its Hearing Statement (ES8.1). This refers merely to SB59 (pg 80-83) and SB83 (pg 17); neither of which introduce or rehearse a need argument as to the reason for the Focused Change.

The Local Authority representative appeared to suggest that a decision taken not to allocate land at Croespenmaen Industrial Estate for housing lead to the opportunity to reconsider the continued need allocate the southern extension of Penyfan.

Since the Hearing the Local Authority have confirmed that the debate concerning whether the Croespenmaen Industrial Estate site should be allocated for housing or retained as employment land was conducted prior to the Deposit Plan being prepared and not subsequent to it. This is evident in consideration of Policies EM.1 and EM.2 of the Deposit Plan as amended by the Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes which do not identify additional employment land having been allocated – the only change to these policies being in relation to FC.05 and the deletion of land at Penyfan.

It was disingenuous therefore for the Local Authority to introduce employment need as justification for the deletion of the site at the Hearing Session as in fact there has not been a change to the supply of employment land identified since the Deposit Plan was published to substantiate this. In reality the site formed part of the range and choice of employment land required by the Deposit Plan to meet the employment needs of the area and absent alternative sites being brought into the supply its contribution in this regard has not diminished.

This therefore returns the matter to amenity considerations as the reason for the focused change in SB59 and SB83. In respect of this, at the Hearing Session, the Local Authority's representative, whilst suggesting that amenity takes many forms, was not able to identify what characteristics are so significant about this site that now preclude its development for B1 Offices as was intended by the Deposit Plan. Similarly, the Local Authority's representative could not identify a good reason why Appendix Nine could not be altered to refer explicitly to the intention for the site to be developed for B1 Offices and for land use arrangement to be appropriate to the proximity of housing on Parkway and the B4251 as would be the case with existing development control policies in any event.

**OJ/RE/06.805  
21<sup>st</sup> May 2010**