

Denbighshire County Council

LDP Pre-Deposit Consultation

June 1st – August 1st 2008

Summary of Responses & Key Issues Arising

a) Purpose of this report

- The purpose of this report is to give Members an overview of representations received in response to the consultation on Denbighshire County Council's LDP Preferred Strategy.
- A broad conclusion and recommendation of a way forward is also provided although this may be subject to change following discussion with Members.

b) Summary

- 462 responses were received regarding the consultation of the pre-deposit LDP¹. Responses have been received from statutory consultees, governmental organisations, non-governmental organisations, town and community councils, businesses, landowners, and members of the public.
- The majority of responses were either individual representations, or individual representations submitted on behalf of organisations. In addition, two petitions were received: One from the Meliden Residents Group with 19 signatures and another regards Graigfechan, with 56 signatures. A questionnaire regarding Bodelwyddan was also prepared and distributed by the Town Council and a total of 92 questionnaires received.
- The majority of responses related to specific sites or areas rather than the overall levels of growth proposed for the County and the general distribution of growth.

Growth Options

- The majority of respondents objected to levels of growth at particular sites rather than the levels of growth proposed for the County as a whole. Where comments related specifically to the growth levels for the County they were mixed, with some support and some objection.
- Concern was expressed that provision was being made for people outside of the County rather than local people. The justification for the level of growth proposed

¹ This figure includes a number of responses that were received after the closing date for the consultation and is therefore higher than the figure reported to Members in September 2008.

was also questioned, both in terms of whether growth levels were high enough, or whether they were too high.

Spatial Strategy

- There was significant objection to the spatial strategy, however, this related to the inclusion of specific sites, rather than the direction of a large proportion of growth to the north of the County. A relatively small number of respondents suggested dispersing development due to constraints in the North and need in rural areas.

Key Strategic Sites

- **Rhyl** – Limited comments received regarding the proposed key strategic site (4 in support, 5 objections). However, some of the comments received included: need to avoid coalescence of neighbouring settlements, need for open space, flood risk on parts of the site, need for development to support regeneration objectives and need for relief road to ease congestion highlighted.
- **Bodelwyddan** – A larger number of objections (6 in support, 97 objections) to the key strategic site though smaller levels of development supported by the majority. Lack of existing infrastructure and development on high quality agricultural land and Greenfield land a concern. The majority of representations received were in response to a questionnaire distributed by the Town Council as a separate exercise to the County Council's consultation.
- **St Asaph** – A small number of objections (2 in support, 6 objections) to the key strategic site citing highways as a constraint. The ability of proposed development to be linked with existing town also raised as a key issue.

Areas of Lower Growth

- **Prestatyn** – a small number of responses received (1 in support, 7 objections), some objecting to the proposed level of growth, one suggesting Prestatyn have higher growth, in line with Rhyl. Concern expressed about flood risk and whether the area is suitable for further development as a result. Concern expressed about the impact of development on the Offa's Dyke trail.
- **Rhuallt** – a large number of objections (No support, 79 objections) received regarding the inclusion of Rhuallt. Concern expressed about the impact such an increase would have on the character of the village and whether the existing infrastructure could support it. Concern expressed about the impact of development on the AONB and the Offa's Dyke trail.
- **Denbigh** – limited comments received regarding Denbigh. No clear support/objection to the level of growth proposed at Denbigh.
- **Ruthin** – limited comments received regarding Ruthin. No clear support/objection to the level of growth proposed at Ruthin.

- **Corwen** – limited comments received regarding Corwen. A small number suggested that there is a need for higher levels of growth in the south of the County, including Corwen.

Conclusion & Recommendations

- The majority of concerns and objections related to specific sites / locations rather than the overall levels of growth or spatial strategy.
- It is therefore recommended in order to achieve the Vision and Objectives, the levels of growth and spatial strategy should be retained.

•

The following recommendations are made:

- 500 dwellings per annum and 50 ha employment land over plan period should be retained;
- The 3 key sites will be assessed in detail to determine the combination of the 3 sites that should be included in the Deposit LDP;
- The 5 lower growth sites will be reviewed. Prestatyn, Denbigh, Ruthin and Corwen should be retained as lower growth sites, detailed allocation will be discussed with Members for the Deposit LDP shortly.
- It is proposed that Rhualt be deleted as a lower growth settlement. Llangollen should be reconsidered as a lower growth settlement, both of which will be discussed with Members. **(NB following discussions with Members Rhualt has been deleted as a Lower Growth Settlement and Llangollen is not proposed as a Lower Growth Settlement).**
- Some of the key policies will need minor amendment.