

**BRIDGEND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATION
ACTION POINTS
Session 6 – Island Farm Bridgend
28 November 2012**

No:	Issue:	Timescale:
6.1	Agenda Item No.Qn1b Would BCBC please confirm what specific uses were authorised by the recent outline mixed use planning permission whether as defined in the Design and Access Statement, the S106 agreement or elsewhere including whether it allows for B1 uses other than B1(a) offices and how the sports and leisure uses are defined.	22 January 2013

	<p>Summary of options requiring further consideration by Inspector following discussion at hearing session.</p> <p>At the end of the Session there were several overlapping options on the table for Island Farm which the Inspector is to consider as follows. Further Action Points in relation to these options are included below.</p> <p>(1) Option 1a No change to the Plan as submitted except a couple of minor changes which BCBC will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) changing of supporting text at 2.3.91 to refer to the presence and extent of the SINC and the associated reduction in the net area available for employment development ii) Whether the access references should take any account of the potential for access to the SP9(2) site from Technology Drive (which the Plan does not mention) as an alternative to the PLA8(5) access from the A48 rather than as a through route <p>Option 1b As above but add a Green Wedge designation to the south based on the suggested Alternative Site boundaries (but only if that could be shown to be consistent with the methodology for designating Green Wedges elsewhere in the LDP).</p> <p>(2) Option 2a To make an alternative site allocation based on the existing HD Limited mixed use development planning permission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) That would be a mixed use PLA3 allocation to be accompanied by individual allocations for employment and sports/leisure in other policies and associated changes to the supporting text. ii) The 6.5ha employment element could either remain as a strategic employment allocation or be changed to an
--	--

	<p>REG1 allocation.</p> <p>iii) There would need to be a new policy in terms of the sports and leisure allocations. These uses would need definition as to the scope of qualifying facilities that would achieve the economic development benefits.</p> <p>iv) A variation HD Limited's proposal would be that the settlement boundary would be moved out to take in the main sports stadia and buildings but would exclude the playing pitches, the football ground, and the nature conservation mitigation land. That would be acceptable development in the countryside but would remain part of the mixed use allocation.</p> <p>v) There would be associated changes to the supporting text including appropriate references to access arrangements (in line with the permitted scheme) and references to the SINC.</p> <p>Option 2b As above but with a variable extent of the employment element between 6.5ha and 11ha with a converse variation in the area available for sports and leisure facilities.</p>
(3)	<p><u>For all the above Options:</u></p> <p>i) To determine whether the Island Farm SINC should be included within the allocation site.</p> <p>ii) To determine whether the Island Farm SINC should be included within the defined settlement boundary.</p> <p>iii) To determine whether this and other SINC's should be shown as such on the Proposals Map or whether that can be left to Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>

Further Action Points related to the above options.

6.4	<p>Re: Option 1a(i) Would BCBC please propose amended wording for LDP paragraph 2.3.91 which explains the presence of a SINC within the SP9(2) allocation and why the net area for employment development is consequently only 11ha.</p>	22 January 2013
6.5	<p>Re: Option 1a(ii) Would BCBC please consider whether it wished to pursue any change to the access references to include the possibility of an access to the SP9(2) site from Technology Drive instead of from the A48.</p>	22 January 2013

	This should have regard to whether such a change to the LDP would have any procedural implications in terms of the sustainability appraisal and any necessary public consultation.	
6.6	Re: Option 1b Inspector to consider in final report in association with other representations on Green Wedge designations elsewhere.	Final report
6.7	Re: Option 2a(ii) BCBC and HD Ltd to comment on whether the employment element should be listed under Policy SP9 or REG1 and, if included under REG1, what business uses should be listed (the parties should seek to agree common ground).	22 January 2013
6.8	Re: Option 2a(iii) HD Ltd and BCBC to suggest how an allocation policy and supporting text should be worded in respect of sports and leisure facilities. (the parties should seek to agree common ground)	22 January 2013
6.9	Re: Option 2a(v) HD Ltd and BCBC may suggest wording for the necessary PLA3 supporting text at LDP appendix 1 (the parties should seek to agree common ground).	22 January 2013
6.10	Re: Option 2b Would HD Ltd and BCBC please provide a figure for the net site area of the mixed use permission that is available for sports and leisure development after deducting the area for employment and roads and for nature conservation mitigation (the parties should seek to agree common ground).	22 January 2013
6.11	Re All options After 22 January 2013 a further opportunity is to be provided for all participants at the hearing and others who have previously submitted relevant written representations at the Deposit and alternative sites stage to comment in writing on the additional submitted evidence arising from the above action points.	After 22 January 2013