

Bridgend County Borough Council
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr

www.bridgend.gov.uk



Bridgend County Borough Council

Joint Housing Land Availability Study 2012

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

*Development Planning
Regeneration and Development
Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council
Angel Street, Bridgend
CF31 4WB*

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) prepared by Bridgend County Borough Council and the Study Group for the 2012 Joint Housing Land Availability Study (JHLAS) for Bridgend County Borough.

1.2 The Bridgend Study Group consists of:

Candice Coombs	Welsh Government
Nick Lloyd	Bridgend County Borough Council
Susan Jones	Bridgend County Borough Council
Gareth Davies	United Welsh Housing Association
Dafydd Cantwell	Hendre Housing Association
Lyndon Griffiths	Wales & West Housing Association
Andrew Smith	Valleys to Coast Housing Association
Elise Coalter	Linc Cymru
Rhidian Clement	Welsh Water
Richard Price	Home Builders Federation (HBF)

1.3 This SoCG follows the process set out in the agreed delivery timetable for the preparation of Bridgend County Borough JHLAS for 2012 and has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Wales, Technical Advice Note 1, Joint Housing Land Availability Studies (TAN 1) and the JHLAS Guidance Note (February 2012).

1.4 This SoCG has been prepared to assist the Welsh Government and the Planning Inspectorate to determine the housing land supply for Bridgend County Borough for 2012.

1.5 Consultation on the Site Schedule and accompanying information took place between Monday 2nd July 2012 and Friday 20th July 2012. Consultation on the Draft Statement of Common Ground took place between the Friday 3rd August 2012 and Friday 17th August 2012.

1.6 Consultation with the HBF on the 2nd Draft of the Statement of Common Ground took place between the Friday 24th August 2012 and Friday 31st August 2012.

- 3.3 The details of each of the non-agreed sites are set out in Appendix 2, along with the concerns raised by the HBF and the Council's justification for the inclusion of the units within the 5 year land supply.

4.0 5 Year Land Supply Calculation

- 4.1 Paragraph 7.5.1 of Technical Advice Note (TAN) 1: Joint Housing Land Availability Studies states "each local planning authority must undertake the necessary calculations and make comparisons between the available land and the future housing requirement". The housing requirement figure of 7957 is identified in the adopted Bridgend UDP and it is against this housing figure that the five-year land supply has been calculated.
- 4.2 The TAN permits the calculation of the five-year land supply using the residual method (a comparison of the land agreed to be genuinely available with the remaining housing provision contained within the adopted development plan). Where the use of this method indicates a shortage or surplus, a comparison of available land with past building rates may be used.
- 4.3 The calculations using both methods are set out below, using both the figures from the Council's assessment of the total land supply, and the Home Builders Federation (HBF) assessment. These figures differ due to there being three sites on which agreement has not been reached, as outlined in Section 3 and in Appendix 2.

5 Year Small Site Completions		All Completions		Total Land Supply		
		2002/3	396			
		2003/4	460			
		2004/5	652			
		2005/6	474			
		2006/7	635			
2007/8	97	2007/8	514		BCBC	HBF
2008/9	62	2008/9	388	U/C	186	186
2009/10	77	2009/10	292	Cat 1	388	385
2010/11	79	2010/11	306	Cat 2	2190	1729
2011/12	47	2011/12	447	Small sites	362	362
	362		4564		3126	2662

TABLE A: COUNTY BOROUGH OF BRIDGEND

**AVAILABILITY OF LAND FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSE BUILDING
IN BRIDGEND AT 1ST APRIL 2012 BASED ON THE BRIDGEND UNITARY
DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2000-2016**

Residual Method							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	UDP Provision 2000-2016	Completions	Remainder	5 year Requirement D=C+(A/16)	Total Annual Building Requirement E=D/5	Total land available	Total Land Supply in years G=F/E
BCBC	7957	5815	2142	2639	528	3126	5.92
HBF	7957	5815	2142	2639	528	2662	5.04

TABLE B: COUNTY BOROUGH OF BRIDGEND

**HOUSE BUILDING PERFORMANCE – RECENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
HOUSING COMPLETIONS**

2011-12 Past Building Rates Method				
	Past 10 year Completions	Average	Total land available	Total Land Supply in years
	A	B	C	D
		A/10		C/B
BCBC	4564	457	3126	6.84
HBF	4564	457	2662	5.82

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It will be noted from the residual method, set out in Table A above, that there is marginally more than a five year supply using both BCBC and HBF figures. If the 3 sites, subject of disagreement with the HBF, were included the total land supply would be 5.92 years however if they were excluded it would reduce to 5.04 years. TAN 1 states that to meet the requirement for a 5-year land supply the quantity of land agreed to be genuinely available may be compared with the remaining housing provision in the adopted development plan - the residual method. In some circumstances, that calculation has indicated land shortages or surpluses, which do not exist in practice. In such cases, a comparison of available land with past building rates can provide a measure of the adequacy of land supply that is more relevant to the achievement of the general objectives of the development plan.

AREA OF DISPUTE:

5.2 Whilst the Council acknowledge that the residual method is regarded as the primary method of calculating the land supply in accordance with TAN 1, it is considered that the past building rates figure should be included within the study and given equal status, given that the 5 year supply period now extends beyond the end of the UDP Plan period (rendering the residual method less appropriate) and also acknowledging the fact that the economic recession since 2008 (i.e. the past 4 years) has created much lower than expected build rates on sites with no known constraints. Using the Bridgend CBC and HBF figures, there is a 6.84 and 5.82 years land supply respectively using the past building rate method of land supply calculation.

5.3 The impact on the house building industry due to the economic circumstances prevailing over the past years was still evident at the time of the 2012 study with lower than expected completion rates recorded on some sites. It is acknowledged that predicting the timescale over which the current adverse economic climate is likely to continue was difficult, but for the purposes of the study it was agreed that the Group would examine each site on its merits in light of the information available.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

TAN 1 Paragraph 7.5.2 advises that to meet the requirement for a 5-year land supply the quantity of land agreed to be genuinely available may be compared with the remaining housing provision in the adopted development plan – the residual method. Whilst the Council acknowledge that the residual calculation method should remain in the study and there is a land supply above the 5 year threshold based on both the Councils and HBF's calculations, it is considered that the past building rates figure should also be included. As the completions to date have been significantly different from the residual method forecasts, variations to the method of calculation may be considered. It is considered in accordance with the advice given in para 7.5.2 of TAN1, the residual calculation indicates a level of availability (very close to the 5 year supply figure, below which there is deemed to be a shortage) that does not exist in practice. As has been normal practice in previous Bridgend JHLAS the land supply calculation has been done on the basis of past building rates as well as on the residual method

Given that Bridgend County Borough Council has had a continuous 5 year supply of land, which has been agreed to be genuinely available, based on the residual method since the adoption of the Bridgend UDP the Council contends that the land supply is not an issue and comparison with the past build rates provides an equally valid, if not more of an accurate indication of available land within the County Borough.

Genuinely available land far exceeds what the house building industry is currently developing and has fallen below what is expected to meet the objectives of the adopted plan. This is not attributed to planning delays as expressed by the HBF (Bridgend CBC is ranked one of the highest in Wales for efficiently processing planning applications) but is largely due to the lack of affordable lending being available to both individuals and businesses. Indeed this is cited nationally by the HBF as the primary reason why house building rates have fallen substantially.

HBF LAND SUPPLY CALCULATION – CONSULTATION RESPONSE (copy of HBF comments also supplied as separate document)

We disagree with the council's suggested approach in paragraph 5.2 that the past building rates methodology should be given equal status. This is contrary to national guidance as the local authority has an adopted UDP until 2016.

In terms of the calculation methodology, the Welsh Government is clear that authorities with adopted UDP's should use the residual method as the primary method of calculation. In terms of the use of past build rates, the TAN and the 2012 Guidance note provide two scenarios where the use of this methodology could be considered appropriate – where there is no adopted plan and where there are land supply shortages that do not exist in practice.

With respect to the first scenario, Bridgend Council has an adopted UDP and therefore this does not apply. In terms of the second scenario, even when using the residual method, the Council has a land supply above the 5 year

threshold, based on both the Council's and our calculations. Therefore, are the council suggesting this is a "land shortage that does not exist in practice"?

Further to the above, we do not believe it is appropriate for the Council to suggest that lower build rates over recent years should be directly attributed to the recession. The council has offered no evidence to justify that the lower build rates experienced in recent years are directly and solely a result of the recession. Indeed, there have been many other issues (particularly planning delays) that have contributed to the lack of delivery on development sites in recent years, which suggests the build rate experienced could have been increased, if the Council acted more promptly to bring sites forward for development.

In terms of the Council's suggestion in paragraph 5.2 that past build rates should be used because the JHLAS study period extends beyond the UDP period, this is also contrary to national guidance. In this respect, Note 3 of the 2012 JHLAS Guidance note specifically states that "Where the adopted development plan will expire during the study period, then the average annual provision from the last five years of the time covered by the development plan should be extrapolated to give an estimate of the land required." Therefore, national guidance is clear that in situations where the study period extends beyond the UDP period, the 'extrapolation method' should be used and not past build rates.

In light of the evidence above, we believe the Council's suggestion to offer past build rates equal status to the residual method is completely inappropriate and contrary to national guidance.

To explore this matter further, and to further demonstrate the inappropriateness of the use of past build rates in the calculation methodology, it is helpful to consider and compare the level of development proposed by previous build rates with more recent evidence on the actual level of development required in the authority over the JHLAS period.

In the case of Bridgend, there are a number of sources of evidence that could be used to identify the most appropriate rate of development over the next 5 years. These sources of evidence include:-

The Council's own evidence to inform the LDP - 9000 dwellings over the period 2006 – 2021 or 600 dwellings per annum. This is essentially the Council's view on the level of development required between 2006 and 2021 (which includes the JHLAS study period). In this respect, the Council has spent considerable time and effort in attempting to justify this proposed development rate and therefore, one would assume that the Council expects to deliver at least this level of development over the next 5 years. As you can see, the assumed development rate from past build rates is almost half this requirement, which surely indicates how ineffectual the use of past build rates would be as a marker for the actual level of house building required in Bridgend.

The Welsh Government's Household Projections. The 2008 Household Projections are produced by the Welsh Government to offer a sound basis with which to identify a suitable housing requirement. The projections are considered to be sound and robust by the Welsh Government and are inherently more robust as a target for future development than merely relying

on previous build rates. In terms of the Household Projections for Bridgend, these demonstrate a requirement for some 11211 households over the period 2006 – 2021. When converted to dwellings (using a standard 4% vacancy rate), this amounts to 11659 dwellings or 777 per annum. Again, we can see how futile the use of past build rates is in terms of identifying a suitable housing requirement for Bridgend, given that it is less than half the identified requirement from the latest Welsh Government Household Projections.

In light of the evidence above, we do not believe the use of past build rates is appropriate for the calculation methodology in the Bridgend JHLAS, as the assumed development rate bears absolutely no relationship to the actual level of housing required in the authority over the next five years.

Conclusion

We do not believe the Council's suggestion to offer past build rates equal status within the JHLAS calculation methodology is appropriate, sound or robust. The Welsh Government is adamant that where local authorities have an adopted UDP, the residual method must be the primary method of calculation to inform the land supply. The Council's suggested approach is also contrary to the requirements of national guidance, both in terms of TAN 1 and the 2012 JHLAS Guidance Note. In addition to this, the assumed development rate from past build rates bears absolutely no relationship to the actual level of development required in the authority, when additional evidence (including the Council's own evidence) is considered.

Appendix 1: Agreed Sites

Private

Address	Units Built Since Last Study	Total Units Capacity	Units Rmng	U/C	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	3(l)
CROWN RD,MAESTEG,UDP H1 (30)	0	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
FORMER LLYNFI HOSPITAL,UDP H1 (75)	0	24	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
FORMER WASHERY SITE, MAESTEG,(HA61)	0	250	250	0	0	30	40	40	25	115
LWR. COMP. SCH. BRIDGEND RD,MAESTEG	0	70	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
WEST OF BETHANIA ST,UDP H1 (32) PART OF	0	16	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
62A & 63,PICTON ST.,UDP H1(34)	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
LAND ADJ. TO 50 HEOL TYWITH,H1 (74)	0	13	13	0	4	4	5	0	0	0
BRACKLA STREET, BRACKLA STREET SHOPPING CENTRE	0	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
BROADLANDS (AREA Z) – H124	6	10	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
BROADLANDS, CAE GLEISON	141	259	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
BROCASTLE ESTATE, BRIDGEND	0	72	30	0	0	30	0	0	0	0
CEFN GLAS ROAD, UDP H1(1)	0	10	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
CHELSEA AVENUE, (LAND AT), CEFN GLAS	5	86	81	12	35	34	0	0	0	0
FORMER WILDMILL BOILER HOUSE	0	10	10	5	0	5	0	0	0	0
LAND AT PRINCESS WAY (DE&T), H1(64)	0	251	251	0	0	50	75	75	51	0
WYNDHAM CLOSE, BRACKLA, BRIDGEND	0	99	99	0	10	45	44	0	0	0
NORTH EAST BRIDGEND, H4(2), UDP H1 (25) PARC DERWEN	103	1500	1389	51	120	150	175	175	175	543
PART OF COITY ROAD SIDINGS, BRIDGEND	0	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
QUARELLA ROAD, BRIDGEND, H1 (85)	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
QUARELLA ROAD UDP H1 (18), FORMER NURSES HOSTEL	0	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
QUEEN STREET 6-10, CF31 1HX	0	10	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH OF JOSLIN ROAD, H1 (65)	9	34	25	4	6	15	0	0	0	0
WATERTON LANE (LAND AT) WATERTON, BRIDGEND	0	11	11	0	5	6	0	0	0	0
MAENDY FARM H1 14,	0	90	90	0	0	0	30	30	30	0
MAENDY FARM(II),UDP H1 (14)	11	211	134	18	35	35	35	11	0	0
WATERHALL ROAD,UDP H1 (17)	0	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
FFORDD Y EGLWYS (LAND OFF),NORTH CORNELLY, BRIDGEND	0	22	22	0	11	11	0	0	0	0
MARLAS FARM, NORTH CORNELLY,BRIDGEND H1 (56)	4	417	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
THOMAS CRESCENT (LAND OFF),NORTH CORNELLY	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAND SOUTH OF HENDRE ROAD,UDP H1 (16)	2	275	94	2	5	6	6	0	0	75
COYCHURCH ROAD/HEOL Y GROES (JUNCTION OF) PENCOED	0	13	13	0	8	5	0	0	0	0
GLAN Y NANT (LAND AT),BRYN ROAD TONDU	0	12	8	0	4	4	0	0	0	0
LAND OFF MAESTEG ROAD,UDP H1 (51)	7	436	347	9	31	40	40	40	40	147
LAND TO THE R/O BRYN ROAD,TONDU H1(84)	0	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

CITY FARM,H1 (69)	0	40	40	0	5	15	20	0	0	0
OS7900&7895,R/O HEOL DEWI SANT,H1 (72)	0	23	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	0
FORMER ABERCERDIN SCHOOL,KENRY STREET	0	21	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
CWRT COLMAN ST.,H10(1)	0	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
HEOL Y FEDWEN/HAUL BRYN,UDP H1 (66)	0	18	11	0	3	3	3	2	0	0
WAUNWEN,UDP H1 (40)	0	70	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
BRYN ROAD OGMORE VALE,	0	12	7	0	2	2	2	1	0	0
LAND AT NORTH ROAD,,OGMORE VALE, BRIDGEND	0	11	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
PANTYRAWEL ROAD (ADJ) PANTYRAWEL	0	17	17	0	17	0	0	0	0	0
WOODLAND STREET (SOUTH OF) WYNDHAM	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
FORMER FFALDAU COLLIERY SITE,PONTYCYMMER	0	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
WOOD STREET,UDP H1 (37)	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
NORTH OF ABER COTTAGES,OGWY ST,UDP H1 (41)	0	14	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
ALBERT EDWARDS, PRINCE OF WALES COURT, PENYLAN AVE	0	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
FORMER SEA BANK HOTEL, CAR PARK, THE GREEN AVENUE	0	60	60	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
PWLL Y WAUN, PORTHCAWL	0	40	40	0	0	20	20	0	0	0
STATION HILL MOT BUILDING SITE	0	11	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	302	4824	3503	179	345	517	496	374	321	1271

RSL

Address	Units Built Since Last Study	Total Units Capacity	Units Rmng	U/C	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	3(i)
MAENDY FARM (II), UDP H1(14) - RSL	18	50	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
MARLAS FARM	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PLUMLEY CLOSE (LAND OFF), NORTH CORNELLY	0	11	11	0	0	11	0	0	0	0
PICTON ST ,FRMER GORICON MET SERVICE SITE	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TROED Y TON, WAUNBANT ROAD, KENFIG HILL	39	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COYCHURCH ROAD (RSL),	0	39	23	0	23	0	0	0	0	0
(CHELSEA AVENUE), (LAND AT), CEFN GLAS, BRIDGEND	12	30	18	5	13	0	0	0	0	0
CAE GLEISION (RSL)	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
THE NURSERIES, NEW ROAD	0	10	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	98	261	68	7	40	21	0	0	0	0

	U/C	CAT 1	CAT 2				3 (i)
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Total	186	385	538	496	374	321	1271
			1729				

Appendix 2: Non-agreed Sites

**Joint Housing Land Availability Study
Site Proforma
Sites for 10 or more units
Bridgend County Borough Council Study Base 01/04/2012**

MID OGWR / BRIDGEND

SITE NAME: Bridgend AFC Ground **LPA Ref No:** 11

Area or Zone: Bridgend **Grid Ref:**

Major Settlement: Bridgend

Market: Private

Description: Residential Development of former Bridgend AFC Ground

Owner: Bridgend County Borough Council
(Nick Corrigan: Development Surveyor, Property Services, Ravens Court, Brewery Lane, Bridgend, CF31 4AP
Tel No: 01656 642716
Email:helen.jones1@bridgend.gov.uk)

Developer:

PLANNING STATUS

Current LPA Status: Bridgend UDP Policy H1(55)
<http://www.bridgend.gov.uk/BCBCUDP/english/maps/imap35e.htm>

Planning consent for site Date:

No Planning Permissions

SITE:

Site is being considered for education development or residential development. It is an allocated housing site which is a green field located close to Bridgend Town Centre.

SITE AREA (Ha) – 1.25

Brownfield (prev. developed)

Greenfield

Total Remaining – 1.25

FORECAST COMPLETIONS

2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-2017
0	20	20	0	0

Units Capacity	Units completed prior to last study	Units completed since last study	Units remaining at 01/04/12	Units under construction	1	2	2*	3(i)	3(ii)
40	0	0	40	0	0	40	0	0	0

Home Builders Comments:

This site was in 3(i) last year and now seems to have moved into the 5 year supply without any change in position or evidence. The site has remained undeveloped for nearly 8 years since its introduction in 2005 and the Council's notes indicate it could be earmarked for education purposes.

The site should be moved back to 3(i).

Councils Comments:

The Council is still promoting the site for residential development due to lack of progress in respect of future education development. This is a greenfield site with no known constraints close to Bridgend Town Centre.

**Joint Housing Land Availability Study
Site Proforma
Sites for 10 or more units
Bridgend County Borough Council Study Base 01/04/2012**

OGMORE AND GARW VALLEYS / LLANGEINOR

SITE NAME: Land at Ty-Nant, Llangeinor **LPA Ref No:** 66

Area or Zone: Garw Valley **Grid Ref:** 291513 187525

Major Settlement: Llangeinor

Market: Private

Description: Residential development

Owner: Mr & Mrs Kirkham

Developer: Mr Kirkham

PLANNING STATUS

Current LPA Status: Bridgend UDP Policy H1(82)
<http://www.bridgend.gov.uk/BCBCUDP/english/maps/prop11e.htm>
 Current planning permission

Planning consent for site:

Application_No	P/03/1169/FUL
Applicant	Mr Kirkham. Per Quorum Associates, 89 Eastgate, Cowbridge, Vale of Glamorgan. CF71 7AA
Location	Ty Nant (land at), Llangeinor, Bridgend
Description	Construction of 10 houses with garages (amended scheme to 02/913)
Decision	Conditional Consent
Decision_Date	21/01/2004
Date_Captured_by	29/09/2003 KPJ

Application_No	P/10/531/FUL
Applicant	Mr P Kirkham. Per PDW Design and Drawing Services, 7 Blackmill Road, Bryncethin, Bridgend. CF32 9YW
Location	Heol Llangeinor, Ty Nant, Llangeinor, Bridgend. CF32 8PN
Post_Code	CF32 8PN
Description	Housing development consisting of 10 detached dwellings
Decision	Conditional Consent
Decision_Date	28/10/2011

SITE:

The site has full planning consent for 10 detached dwellings. The site will most likely be build on an individual plot basis.

SITE AREA (Ha) – 0.63

Brownfield (prev. developed)**Greenfield**

Total Remaining – 0.63

FORECAST COMPLETIONS:

2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-2017
3	3	3	1	0

Units Capacity	Units completed prior to last study	Units completed since last study	Units remaining at 01/04/12	Units under construction	1	2	2*	3(i)	3(ii)
10	0	0	10	0	3	7	0	0	0

Home Builders Comments:

This site has been in the 5 year supply since 2003 without any sign of development. The original full permission has been allowed to lapse and the owners have now submitted a new application. There is no developer interest and it has been in the supply for more than 9 years, which is contrary to the TAN guidance. In the past this site has been moved back to 3(i) by Welsh Government representatives chairing JHLAS meetings, only to be brought back in by the Council, without any firm evidence to justify it's proposed development. Notwithstanding the WG Guidance, there are only so many years we can continue to leave sites like this in the supply, before they must be moved out in order to make the supply realistic. The position of the site in 3(i) does not prevent the site from being developed, however it does enable the land supply to only reflect sites that are genuinely going to come forward over the next 5 years. This site should be moved back to 3(i) as there is clearly no evidence to justify its position in Category 2.

Councils Comments:

The site has received a new full planning consent and the owner has gone to considerable expense in respect of submitting a full planning application and providing detailed designs in respect of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Council considers the conclusion of the 2011 JHLA Inspector is still valid who concluded "The site is allocated for housing development in the UDP and as such it is appropriate to include it in the JHLAS in accordance with para. 7.1.2 of TAN 1. There is a presumption that sites that remain undeveloped for more than 5 years should be reclassified as being unlikely to occur within the 5 year period. However, full planning permission has recently been granted for the site and I have no reason to find that the development will not take place as envisaged in the JHLAS. I consider the site should be included in the five year JHLAS land supply calculations".

**Joint Housing Land Availability Study
Site Proforma
Sites for 10 or more units
Bridgend County Borough Council Study Base 01/04/2012**

PORTHCAWL AND COASTAL VALE / PORTHCAWL

SITE NAME; Porthcawl Regeneration Area **LPA Ref No:** 81

Area or Zone: Porthcawl **Grid Ref:**

Major Settlement: Porthcawl

Market Private / Affordable Housing

Description: Waterfront regeneration to include retail, amusement park, leisure, festival retail, houses holiday accommodation and parking.

Owner Bridgend County Borough Council
(Nick Corrigan: Development Surveyor, Property Services, Ravens Court, Brewery Lane, Bridgend, CF31 4AP
Tel No: 01656 642716
Email:helen.jones1@bridgend.gov.uk)

PLANNING STATUS

Current LPA Status: Bridgend UDP Policy H1(41)
<http://www.bridgend.gov.uk/BCBCUDP/english/maps/prop29c.htm>

The Porthcawl Waterfront – Planning Guidance
<http://www.bridgend.gov.uk/web/groups/public/documents/services/044576.hcsp>

Planning consent for site:

Application_No	P/08/325/BCB
Applicant	Bridgend County Borough Council. Per RPS Planning and Dev, Park House, Greyfriars Road, Cardiff, CF10 3AF.
Location	Porthcawl Harbourside, Porthcawl, Bridgend.
Post_Code	
Description	Mixed use regeneration incl retail/commercial units, public realm, residential, community, leisure building, car parking
Decision	Pending
Decision_Date	

SITE:

Joint venture company Chelverton Deeley Freed has been selected as the preferred developer for phase one of the scheme. This will focus on Salt Lake and Hillsboro Place, and will include the creation of a new Tesco superstore.

SITE AREA (Ha) – 19

Brownfield (prev. developed)

Greenfield

Total Remaining – 19

FORECAST COMPLETIONS

2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-2017
0	14	80	160	160

Units Capacity	Units completed prior to last study	Units completed since last study	Units remaining at 01/04/12	Units under construction	1	2	2*	3(i)	3(ii)
1350	0	0	1350	0	0	414	0	936	0

Home Builders Comments:

At the last study, we stated the figures were optimistic, and the Council stated the Developers would be undertaking public consultations etc. Please could the council clarify who the developers are and provide evidence to prove the proposed development rate is achievable.

In light of the information to state that the developers have now pulled out of the scheme and considering the length of time the site has remained in the 5 year supply without development, we believe the figures should be moved to category 3(i), until we have firm evidence to prove it will be developed in the next 5 years.

Councils Comments:

Chelverton Deeley Freed and Tesco were the preferred developer and operator, however they are not proceeding with the scheme, and a formal announcement by the Leader was made to this effect at the Council meeting of the 11th July 2012. The Council are fully committed to delivering the regeneration of this scheme and as a result is undertaking the necessary infrastructure works to deliver this phase of the regeneration without the continued involvement of Chelverton Deeley Freed and Tesco. Related infrastructure work at the harbour is already programmed and funded.