My ref/ Fy nghyf:  INSP 009

This statement has been issued in response to four questions posed by the Council.

Where the Council agree with the Inspector that a change needs to be made to policy does the Inspector want us to set out the change? If so does he have a preference for the format of the change?

If the Council accepts the need to change a policy, it should acknowledge this in its statement and then include the change on that attached schedule template that incorporates all the changes the Council propose to make since the LDP was first submitted for examination (MAC changes.doc). I would urge the Council to start working on this now if it does intend to make changes. The Council accepted in response to INSP001 that it would replace all references to "houses" with "dwellings". This will result in many very minor changes. The Council does not need to set out all these changes on the template. I will take this as read. I do not advise the Council to start numbering any MAC changes yet as my experience from other examinations is that Councils make a number of soundness and other changes during the examination.

My experience from other examinations has also taught me that the Council is often asked to concede points at sessions or to carry out further research (e.g., dig out a planning permission). It is often not possible for the Council to give a yes/no answer on the spot. I therefore propose to write down all such requests at each session using the attached template (MAC report.doc). The programme officer will put these on the Internet. The Council will then be asked to provide written responses to the various matters by noon on 16 July and to make any further changes to the plan on the Matters Arising Changes schedule.

Where the Inspector has asked the Council the question previously does he want us to refer to the earlier response or is he suggesting that we have not addressed the issue fully?

There is no need to repeat evidence already given but the Council must give precise references to previous evidence prepared to help other participants. The format of the Council's response to INSP001 was helpful and should be followed. The point of asking a question again is to allow some time for the Council's and other participants' answers to a question to be aired in a public arena.
Hearing Session 3, Affordable Housing, Question 6. Is the Inspector referring to the overall target figure in the Plan or the 10% target?

Policy SP4 has been substantially rewritten to reduce downward the original policy target of 800 affordable dwellings. The discussion will now focus on the focussed change version of the plan and seek to clarify the distinction between Policies SP4 and DM8. I will want to know why sites H1.17 and H1.18 have been identified for 100% affordable housing and why other HC sites are too. What policy would apply to the developer of HC sites if they had to apply to renew or amend a planning permission on a site? What would happen if other sites allocated for 100% affordable housing could not deliver this?

Hearing Session 20, Monitoring Indicators, Question 1. Does the Inspector want us to review all of our monitoring indicators in our response?

I will conduct a detailed review of all of the monitoring indicators. The Council should be aware that I find a number of the focussed change monitoring indicators imprecise as output measurements. The deadlines given for reviewing policies appear unclear too given the Council's legal obligations under the LDP Regulations to start a review every four years.

Some of the indicators the Council has chosen can already be reviewed now (e.g., housing completions from 2006 to 2011 referred to in Policy SP4). Why hasn’t the Council therefore conducted this review and adjusted its policy in the light of any findings? It is not clear why the Council has chosen other indicators (for example, house prices). I have not seen a link between the renewable energy targets in Policy SP7 and specific local projects. The indicators for Policy SP8 merely record the target employment rate for Blaenau Gwent. This might be unsophisticated since local employment rates are to some extent dictated by outside factors such as the performance of the wider economy and not by activities in the LDP. I intend to ask the Council why it does not seek to track Blaenau Gwent employment rates relative to a wider area, for example, reducing the gap between the county and the South Wales average. Some of the Council’s indicators have implications for site allocations and I intend to ask how any potential policy review might affect site allocations.

The Council may wish to prepare a further revision of its indicators in the light of these comments if it has time. However, this hearing session will be a little more informal in style than others and I would therefore be content for the Council to review its position on monitoring indicators after this session given the many other tasks its staff have to do at the moment. However, it should bring an answer to all of the indicators where it has identified a 2011 target.

The Council should include any changes that arise in a schedule to the other Matters Arising Changes it may make. Indeed, it may be the case that the Council makes other changes to its monitoring indicators as a
direct result of changes to the plan made in other sessions or rewrites the monitoring indicators.

Vincent Maher
INSPECTOR/ AROYGYDD
29 May 201
Day 1:
Session 1: Development Strategy/ Vision

## MATTERS ARISING FROM THE HEARING SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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Matters Arising Changes

Explanatory Note

The Schedule of Matters Arising Changes to the Blaenau Gwent County Local Development Plan (LDP) provides a single reference point for all the following Matters Arising Changes that have been made since the LDP was first submitted for examination in February 2012. It incorporates:

- Changes arising from written queries raised by the Inspector including the questions for the various hearing sessions
- Changes in response to representations received, including those identified through Statements of Common Ground
- Changes arising from consideration of the matters and issues discussed at the hearing sessions
- Changes suggested to correct grammatical or similar mistakes
- Changes to provide factual updates to information in the LDP

The Schedule is set out in Chapter order. Where multiple changes are made to a paragraph or policy the first version will be the most recent and where changes supersede those made in the Focussed Changes, this will be made clear in the policy / paragraph column.

The changes are indicated in the form of strikethrough for deletions and bold text for additions.

At the request of the Inspector, the changes in the Schedule have been divided into three categories as follows (highlighted in the first column of the Schedule):

A – Those matters that go to soundness
Having regard to the representations, discussions at the EIP and Government publications submitted since the Submission of the LDP, the council suggests the following changes to ensure that the LDP sound.

**B – Matters that clarify policy**
The council suggests a number of changes that provide clarification to policies and text.

**C – Minor textual changes e.g. updates and grammatical changes**
The council proposes a number of minor factual and textual changes.
### Local Development Plan - Changes for Reasons of Soundness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page (Feb 2012 Doc)</th>
<th>Policy / paragraph</th>
<th>Changes (additions are in bold and struck-through)</th>
<th>Justification for change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAC S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(this supersedes FC xxx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Development Plan – Other Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page (Feb 2012 Doc)</th>
<th>Policy / paragraph</th>
<th>Changes (additions are in bold and struck-through)</th>
<th>Justification for change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAC O1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC O2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(this supersedes FC xxx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC O3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>