

Carmarthenshire Local Development Plan

Advisory Panel Meeting

23.07.07

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
	<p><u>Present</u></p> <p>Cllr Clive Scourfield CS Cllr Ivor Jackson IJ Cllr Jane Tremlett Cllr JT Cllr Sandra Cooke SC Cllr Keri Thomas KT Cllr June Williams JW Cllr Eirwyn Williams EW Jon Timothy, Forward Planning Manager JT Ian Llewelyn, Senior Forward Planning Officer IL Bethan Lovering, Forward Planning Officer BL Neil Bateman, Policy Officer NB Steve Murphy, Senior Solicitor SM Angela Robinson, Administrative Assistant AR</p> <p>1. <u>Apologies</u></p> <p>Cllr Peter Cooper Cllr Jeff Thomas</p> <p>2. <u>Coffee, Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>3. <u>Election of Chair/Vice Chair</u></p> <p>JW was proposed as Chairperson and all were in agreement. IJ was proposed as Vice Chair and again all were in favour.</p> <p>4. <u>Terms of Reference/Constitution</u></p> <p>JT explained the strict time table laid down by the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) explaining that further meetings may be convened at short notice at key stages of the Plan. The Advisory Panel will have an important role by</p>	

<p>taking political ownership of the Plan.</p> <p>Concern was expressed as to the possible penalties that would be faced if the timetable was not adhered to.</p> <p>The Plan is to be prepared over a four year period.</p> <p>Cllr JT suggested the use of Carmarthenshire Radio & local media as a method of advertising the LDP preparation process.</p> <p>CS expressed concern that some bodies had not been directly consulted. JT replied that whilst participation would be invited from all, a line would have to be drawn with regards differentiating between general and named consultees. CS agreed, adding that open meetings for public debate would be impractical, however – see action.</p> <p>CS stated that local access groups are not mentioned in the DA. It will be the responsibility of the Advisory Panel to give the stakeholders guidance to enable them to bring their specific spheres of knowledge to the table and play an active and constructive role. Although the Local Authority and Stakeholders will be in a position to shape things within the LDP, JT pointed out that the Inspector’s decision cannot be challenged.</p> <p>SM outlined the purpose of the Stakeholder Forum which will be to act as a sounding board throughout the preparation process requiring regular involvement from representatives. Above this tier is the Advisory Panel whose main purpose will be to ensure that the whole process is carried out in accordance with the Delivery Agreement. The Panel will have a duty to scrutinise and evaluate and may</p>	<p>check whether the stakeholder forum meetings are open to the public as observers.</p> <p>add local access forum to list of consultees</p>
---	--

	<p>also be required to arbitrate on opposing view points.</p> <p>It was proposed that the Executive Board Member for Regeneration and Leisure and the Chair of Planning should sit on the Key Stakeholder Forum. Representatives on the Forum should remain the same to retain continuity. It was envisaged that meetings would be held every three months with possibly four Stakeholder Forums in total to correspond with key stages of the Plan.</p> <p>SC asked whether substitutes would be allowed should a member of the Key Stakeholder Forum be unable to attend a meeting. SM stated that this would be impractical.</p> <p>If for any reason a Member should stand down the responsibility for a replacement would go back to the Executive Board.</p> <p>JT suggested that the Chairperson of the Advisory Panel could also be Chairperson for the Stakeholder Forum, but admitted that the Key Stakeholder Forum may wish to nominate their own Chairperson. SM emphasised the importance of a link between the two. CS suggested that SM be present at the first Stakeholder Forum as a link. The Members asked if they could sit as observers to the Stakeholder Forum. SM did not see a problem although this issue would need to be clarified. JW requested that Members receive notes of Forum meetings.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Role of the Advisory Panel</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4.2 of the DA explains clearly the role of the Advisory Panel.</p>	<p>check whether the stakeholder forum meetings are open to local members as observers.</p>

<p>6.</p>	<p>Introduction to the Local Development Plan</p> <p>The Advisory Panel were presented with a booklet explaining the LDP process. JT stated that if anyone needs more information his team would be only too happy to assist. After discussion, it was felt appropriate that an Away Day/Training Day be organised for members of the Advisory Panel. A suitable date and venue to be arranged. JT requested that any items to be placed on the agenda should be emailed to him. Attention was also drawn to a forthcoming WAG training day, on the entire development plan process.</p>	<p>arrange date and venue</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Draft Delivery Agreement – Representations Received</p> <p>Members were presented with copies of a report of representations received in respect of the Delivery Agreement. The Members ratified the Officer’s recommendations in respect of the representations. Cllr JT enquired as to whether the small number of responses should be a cause for concern. JT replied that the lack of responses could be taken as an indication of the public’s approval of the document.</p> <p>JT added that one or two Community Councils had requested that the Forward Planning Section attend community council meetings. Seminars for the Community Councils might represent a more appropriate mechanism. EW was concerned that more Community Councils had not responded and suggested that they be contacted again. Discussion followed on the probable reasons for the poor response from Community Councils. JW felt that a reminder should be sent out; the rest of the Members agreed.</p> <p>JT emphasised, however, that in view of the tight timescale if reminders are sent it would be unlikely that responses</p>	

<p>8.</p>	<p>would be received in time for us to respond to WAG by the deadline of 31st July 2007. Nevertheless, it was felt that community council responses would be relevant and could be kept on file, even if they did not arrive in time for the submission deadline.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <p>The Stakeholder Forum should consist of two urban community councils and two rural community councils. It was hoped that these could be selected from volunteers. It was noted that Llanelli Town Council and Carmarthen Rural Council wish to be members. Of the remaining two, it was emphasised that one should ideally be situated within the old Carmarthen District area and the other from Dinefwr. CS enquired about <i>One Voice Wales</i>.</p> <p>The key stages and steps in the preparation of the LDP are set out in the Delivery Agreement. The sequence of events remains as in the same draft DA but has been extended by six months. This will consequently result in a protracted period between this and subsequent PAG meetings. The timing of future meetings will be somewhat irregular, coinciding generally with the key stages of LDP preparation.</p> <p>JT explained that the next stage before we go to the Stakeholder Forum is to develop a vision and establish LDP objectives, key issues and strategic options.</p> <p>JW asked whether parking in town centres and flats would be covered by the Plan. JT explained that in accordance with WAG advice LDPs should be broad in their content and such matters as parking should come under the terms of supplementary planning guidance.</p>	<p>JT to write again to community councils explaining the amendments to the DA and the extension of the LDP timetable.</p>
-----------	---	--

	<p>CS asked whether the Assembly had given us any idea as to how many houses should be built in Carmarthen and SC enquired as to the definition of affordable housing. JT concluded that we can project how many houses will be built but not who lives in them.</p> <p><u>AOB/Close</u></p> <p>9. JT concluded that should the Members have any further queries they should contact the Forward Planning Section. There being no further business the meeting closed at 3.30p.m.</p> <p>It was agreed that the next meeting of the Advisory Panel would be held before the first Key Stakeholder Forum.</p>	
--	---	--