

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Sustainability Group

Meeting 7

9 November 2007

Record of Meeting

Attendance

Phil Griffiths	Caerphilly CBC (Countryside)
Dave Lucas	Caerphilly CBC (Forward Planning)
Richard Jones	Countryside Council For Wales
Gayle Wootton	Countryside Council For Wales
Caroline Drayton	Environment Agency
Jim Parry	Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust
Stanley Evelyn	BT
Karen Gifford	Gwent Police
Pat Martin	Caerphilly CBC (Conservation)
Alison Jones	Caerphilly CBC (Ecology)
Paul Cooke	Caerphilly CBC (Sustainability)
Melanie Phillips	Caerphilly CBC (Economic Development)
Maria Godfrey	Caerphilly CBC (Environmental Health – Pollution)
Steve Martin	CCBC Energy
Ralph Bourke	Caerphilly CBC (Research)
Rhian Kyte	Caerphilly CBC (Planning) [Observer]
Rachael Hopkins	Caerphilly CBC (Planning) [Observer]

Apologies

Alison Palmer	GAVO
Neil Maylan	Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust
Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water



REGENERATION

THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT

EDUCATION FOR LIFE

HEALTH SOCIAL CARE & WELL BEING



Outcomes For The Meeting

1. To Consider and agree the changes proposed to the SEA/SA Part 1.
2. For all members to be made aware of the next stages in the process of producing the Caerphilly Local Development Plan
3. For all members to be made aware of the next stages in the process of producing the Environmental Report (Part 2) for the SEA/SA in respect of the Caerphilly Local Development Plan.

21 Report back from previous meeting

- 21.1 DL outlined that the work from the previous meeting resulted in assessments of the alternative strategies that, following undergoing quality assurance, were found to be sound and were included in the final SEA/SA document, with some additions to the mitigations. As such it was felt that it was not necessary to produce a report of the meeting as it is effectively the results contained in the SEA/SA and LDP documents.
- 21.2 Both DL and PG thanked the members of the group for their continued support and effort in respect of the SEA/SA which was greatly valued and added an important element of impartiality to the work on the SEA/SA. In addition DL advised that the reputation of the group for their work and co-operation with the Council had been more widely recognised, with both the Council and outside bodies recognising the work that had been done.

22 Presentation and discussion on Proposed Changes to the Part 1 SEA/SA as a result of the Pre-Deposit Consultation process.

- 22.1 DL gave a presentation on the Pre-Deposit Consultation exercise and the responses and comments received (a copy of the presentation is attached as Appendix 1). Overall 1589 representations had been received, of which 102 related to the SEA/SA (10 support, 22 comment and 70 objections). Of these objections 70 related to the Scoping Report, 12 to the LDP Appendices (which contained the Assessment Results and the Mitigation Tables), 10 on the Assessments of the Alternative Strategies, 9 on the Review of relevant plans programmes and policies and one on the SEA/SA content in the LDP Strategy. Two issues arose during the presentation:
- i) In relation to monitoring issues Point 9 referred to conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment. Given the potential over the exact definition of what the Historic Environment is, a definition should be included.
 - ii) During discussion on the “Aftermath 2” slide of the presentation the question was raised over whether the Group would have the opportunity to consider the alternative sites prior to them being made subject to the required consultation exercise. It was generally felt that the group would welcome the chance to consider them and it was agreed that a n item be placed on a subsequent meeting agenda to discuss the issue and agree what would happen.
- 22.2 Following the presentation the Group went through the proposed changes to the SEA/SA documentation, copies of the relevant extracts from the documents were handed to members on the day, in order to get comments and in-principle agreement for the changes. It was advised that, as the changes had only just been handed out, and were not available for the

meeting, members could consider the changes during the 14-day period for commenting on the record of the meeting. The group then considered the changes in document order.

Document 1 - Scoping Report

22.3 The following discussion were held on the changes to the Scoping Report:

- i) Paragraph G6 – Text Inclusion
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- ii) Paragraph G9 – Text and Figure inclusions
Concern was expressed that the rewording of the paragraph sought to safeguard minerals to “ensure their potential for working” when safeguarding could never actually realise the working of the minerals. It was agreed that the officers would review the wording of the MTANs and ensure the additional text reflects the wording of the MTANs. Following consideration of the MTANs it is proposed to revise the rewording to state:
“Government guidance advises that mineral and coal deposits should be safeguarded from permanent development that would either sterilise or hinder their extraction by future generations.”
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- iii) Paragraph B2 – Change of Tile to Cardiff beech Woods.
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- iv) Biodiversity Indicator c. – Reword
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- v) Paragraph CF2 – Additional text
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- vi) Paragraph CF3 - Additional text
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- vii) Paragraph 7.1 – amendments to text
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- viii) Chapter 8 – Amend single reference of SA to the correct term SEA/SA
During the discussion on this change it was pointed out that the timescale for the process would need to be amended to reflect the 4 month slippage that has been agreed.
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- ix) Paragraph 1.1 – amendments to text
During discussions on this issue it was noted that the word “sites” had been incorrectly deleted after the term “Natura 2000”. It was agreed that this should be reinstated.
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- x) Paragraph 4.21 – title amendment to SAC
During discussions on this issue, it was noted that there had been a change in the status of the Severn Estuary, it now being a “Candidate” SAC. It was agreed to amend the text to reflect this
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- xi) Population and Human Health Indicator 5d. – additional text
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- xii) Population and Human Health Target 2 for 10i. – additional text
[Agreed in Principle](#)

- xiii) Air Pollution Chapter – Inclusion of text and figures in respect of commuting
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- xiv) Paragraph W1 – Additional text
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- xv) Paragraph W6 – Amended text
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- xvi) Water Indicator d. – Amended text
[Agreed in Principle](#)
- xvii) Paragraph G3 – Amended text
[Agreed in Principle](#)

Document 2 - Review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies

- 22.4 DL advised that a number of comments had requested the inclusion of additional documents within the Review and that all the documents had been summarised into the table. Copies of the amendments were available but not enough for everyone, so it was agreed that copies of the changes would be circulated with the Record of the Meeting. DL also proposed that, as the Review was essentially a factual account of the requirements of the documents that consideration of these would best be undertaken during the 14 day period for comments on the Record, rather than to consider the information fresh at the meeting. This course of action was agreed and the changes were agreed in principle subject to comments made during the 14 day period.

Document 3 – Assessment of Preferred and Alternative Strategies

- 22.5 DL advised that this document attracted the only significant objection to the procedure that had been adopted for the production of the SEA/SA. Following a meeting with CCW this has now been identified as a drafting error and upon supplying the correct information, CCW were happy that there was no longer any objection to the procedure. There are only 3 changes proposed to this document:
- i) Assessment Test 2 (Middle Column) – amendment to reflect that the starting Test was different from the amended Test.
[Agreed in Principle](#)
 - ii) Assessment Test 3 (Middle Column) – Deletion of the word “wide” to reflect that the starting Test was different from the amended Test.
[Agreed in Principle](#)
 - iii) Appendix 3 – Ranking of Alternatives in Sustainability Order – Amend assessment of option A to state 2nd “least” sustainable
[Agreed in Principle](#)

- 22.6 In conclusion DL advised that the level and nature of the comments and support received for the SEA/SA indicates that the SEA/SA is proving to be a sound document that is generally being considered as an acceptable basis for the consideration of the sustainability and environmental impacts of the emerging LDP and for incorporating environmental considerations into the LDP decision making process. DL also advised that the value of the work of the Group cannot be understated and that their input and impartiality of view was fundamental to the strength and status of the SEA/SA.

23 Presentation on the next stages of the procedure of producing the Deposit LDP

- 23.1 DL gave a presentation of the procedure leading up to and including the Depositing of the LDP and its corresponding consultation processes (a copy of the presentation is included as

Appendix 2). The presentation was for information purposes. No additional points were raised as a result of the general discussion following the presentation.

24 Presentation on the next stages of the procedure in producing the Environmental report in respect of the Caerphilly LDP.

24.1 PG gave a presentation on the SEA/SA procedures that accompany the LDP procedure outlined in the previous presentation (a copy of the presentation is included as Appendix 3). The presentation was for information purposes. From the general discussion of the presentation, the following 2 points were raised:

- i) It was requested that the Group has an input into alternatives and new sites throughout the process, particularly in respect of the Alternative Site consultation procedure, where the Group expressed a desire to have input prior to the consultation exercise. As part of this discussion the issue of who was responsible for ensuring that the alternative sites are in compatibility with the SEA/SA was raised. It was advised that the objector would be required to prove this, but the Group could consider the sites and provide a view for the council to consider.
- ii) The final part of the presentation related to potential action beyond the formal LDP and SEA/SA procedure. The Group again raised the issue of whether it could be involved in the production of Supplementary Planning Guidance, such as site development briefs, to continue the SEA/SA principle into more detailed areas. It was agreed that an item be placed on a subsequent agenda for discussion by the Group.

In conclusion DL and PG thanked the members for the efforts to date and for their patience and interest in the days matters and reiterated the importance of the Group and how valuable the members input is into the production of the SEA/SA.

The meeting closed.