

## **BRIDGEND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATION**

### **SESSION 6 - ISLAND FARM, BRIDGEND**

#### **OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE THAT HAS BEEN SUBMITTED SINCE THE HEARING ON 28 NOVEMBER 2012**

##### **Introduction**

As discussed at the hearing, HD Ltd has secured a planning permission for the Island Farm site for a mixed use business, sports and leisure development. This differs significantly from the strategic employment allocation proposed for the site by Policy SP9 of the submitted Local Development Plan.

At the Deposit stage of the Plan, HD Ltd submitted representations which seek to amend the Plan to more closely reflect the planning permission that has been granted by the Council.

At the hearing a number of options were discussed for amending the Plan to address this and related issues including those arising from representations by other persons. These options are set out on the enclosed 'Action Points' and they are still under consideration by the Inspector.

The Action Points also sought some additional information from the Council and HD Ltd about the site and about the planning permission that has been granted. It indicated that an opportunity would be provided to comment on any additional evidence which was submitted after the hearing in response to the Action Points.

##### **Further Evidence**

Following the hearing Bridgend County Borough Council has given consideration to what 'Matters Arising Changes' may be appropriate if the Plan were to be amended to a mixed use allocation. A paper from the Council is enclosed which suggests wording for a new Policy COM16 to include the recreation and leisure elements of a mixed use allocation. The employment allocation would be reduced in area to 6.56ha reflect the planning permission but would remain part of the Policy SP9 strategic employment allocation. Whilst not specified in the Council's paper, it would be necessary to add the mixed use site to the list of PLA3 Regeneration and Mixed Use schemes as PLA3(21) in accordance with the practice followed elsewhere in the Plan for mixed use sites. The Council's paper does include suggested amendments to the supporting text in that regard including a description of the mixed use PLA3 site to be included in an appendix to the Plan and which would also refer to the safeguarding of the listed PoW building and the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

In correspondence agents for HD Ltd have supported some of the Council's proposed changes but have proposed different wording for Policy COM16 and the Appendix. A summary of their comments and suggestions is also enclosed.

## **Opportunity for Comment**

As indicated in the Action Points at 6.11, there is now an opportunity for those bodies and individuals who were represented at the hearing or who have previously submitted written representations about the site at the deposit of alternative site consultation stages to comment in writing on the further evidence submitted by the Council and HD Ltd. HD Ltd have already comment on the Council's suggested changes. However there is also an opportunity for the Council to comment on the further changes suggested by HD Ltd.

Any comments should be sent to the Programme Officer to be received by **12 March 2013**.

## **SESSION 6 – ISLAND FARM**

### **SUMMARY OF FURTHER EVIDENCE FROM HD LTD THAT WAS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING**

#### Extract from Letter of 22 January 2013 from Savills

“There are four separate action points whereby [the Inspector has] indicated that BCBC and HD Ltd should seek to agree common ground. Savills, on behalf of HD Ltd, has exchanged comments on these action points as requested and have agreed common ground on two of the action points – 6.7 and 6.10. However we have not been able to agree common ground on action points 6.8 and 6.9. These action points relate to the draft wording of Policy COM16 and the PLA3 supporting text.

BCBC is concerned that HD Ltd’s proposed wording allows for too much flexibility and is considered by BCBC to contribute to the uncertainty over the permitted scheme being delivered. ... HD Ltd’s position has not changed insofar as the allocation of the site needs to reflect the planning approval. The reason for [our] suggested wording is to reflect that Development Plans highlight the land use issues (which our wording achieves) and is not meant to go into prescriptive detail. Rather it will allow for flexibility in the development of the size and components of the sports and leisure facilities so that, if necessary, the proposals can respond to changing sporting demands and sport occupier requirements. Therefore BCBC’s comments about the ‘uncertainty of delivery’ are unwelcome and cannot be concluded as a result of our suggested policy wording. As referred above, we have addressed the land use phrasing which we believe better suits the policy text. [The Inspector} will recall the numerous comments made at the examination about a commitment to delivery (which Mr Llewelyn at BCBC confirms).

HD Ltd has also sought to ensure that the fallback position (to retain the site for strategic employment uses) as proposed by BCBC is clarified in both the supporting text to policies COM16 and PLA3 – as set out [below].”

#### HD Ltd - suggested wording for Policy COM16 and supporting paragraph 6.2.26

“Policy COM16

Island Farm Recreation and Leisure

Land at Island Farm is allocated for mixed use development comprising of the following recreation and leisure uses:-

- sports stadia ranging from 2,000 to 15,000 seats in size with additional ancillary training pitches;
- an indoor tennis centre plus outdoor courts;
- an indoor training pitch and sports hall offering a range of sports;
- an indoor swimming [pool] within the sports centre;
- ancillary offices and uses; and
- a 16.7ha (41 acre) of SINC area safeguarded for nature conservation.

6.2.26 The site forms part of a mixed use scheme for recreation, leisure and strategic B1 employment purposes as defined by Policy 3(21) and reflects the planning status of the site at the time of adoption of the LDP. A large proportion of the site was previously allocated solely for strategic employment purposes, however the application was granted consent as

the scheme was considered to be of strategic value for the County Borough. However, should the recreational and leisure facility (or any elements) not be delivered for any reason and providing that there is an up to date evidence base to demonstrate there is a requirement for additional strategic employment land, the council may require the site (or parts of the site) to be retained for future Strategic Employment purposes on the parts of the site within the settlement boundary”

“Note to the Inspector: If it is confirmed that the settlement boundary is to be drawn to reflect the built elements of the recreations and leisure proposals (the main stadia, tennis centres and courts [sports?] centre as discussed at the Hearing Session. Only the pitches along the southern boundary and the [SINC] are to be located outside of the settlement boundary”.

HD Ltd – Suggested amendment (underlined) to the Council’s proposed Paragraph A1.21.2

“The mixed-use proposal will enable the Island Farm strategic employment allocation to be developed as a subsequent phase and logical extension to the existing highly successful and prestigious Bridgend Science Park. Furthermore, located as it is in south-west Bridgend it serves an area of recent significant residential development at Broadlands, which lacks any significant employment opportunities. Whilst under policy SP9(2), 6.56ha of the site is allocated for strategic employment uses, should the recreational and leisure facility (or any elements) not be delivered for any reason and providing that there is an up to date evidence base to demonstrate there is a requirement for additional strategic employment land, the Council may require the site (or parts of the site) to be retained for future Strategic Employment purposes on the parts of the site located within the settlement boundary.”