



Planning Aid **Wales**  
Cymorth Cynllunio **Cymru**

## **Community Engagement**

### **Pembrokeshire County Council's LDP Draft Preferred Strategy**

#### **Community, City & Town Council Events**

#### **Issues Report**

## 1. Context

Planning Aid Wales has been instructed by Pembrokeshire Council to support community engagement activity in relation to Pembrokeshire County Council's Local Development Plan Preferred Strategy consultation.

Our initial instructed brief was as follows:

*To prepare and deliver three engagement events in accordance with Pembrokeshire's Delivery Agreement in relation to the draft Preferred Strategy.*

However, following discussions with the Council's Development Policy Manager it was decided that the LPA would introduce the events and make the presentation on the draft preferred strategy and candidate sites. Our agreed work would be to introduce the break out groups to discuss the Rural Facilities Study and the Candidate Sites, facilitate discussions and collate comments to present to the Council in a written report.

To meet our instruction our work involved:

- Analysis and understanding of the current position of the LDP.
- Review of key documents and discussions with Planning Officers as required.
- Identifying the methods of engagement for the two CTC events to be held on 14th and 21st January 2019.
- Attend both events as facilitators for discussions and understanding of the Rural Facilities Study and Candidate Sites current plan working together with Pembrokeshire Officers. The broad purpose of the events will be to identify issues. Leading a plenary session. Advise on next steps and how communities / stakeholders can input into the process. Prepare written statement of the discussions for the Council.

As part of the process the following work was carried out by the Council:

- i. Provision of all relevant planning documents.
- ii. Organise appropriate venues for the events.
- iii. Invitations to interested parties to attend events.
- iv. Provision of speakers and presentations in relation to details of the preferred strategy and candidate sites.
- v. Translation of material to Welsh.

## **2. About Planning Aid Wales**

Planning Aid Wales is a registered charity that advocates and supports community involvement in planning in Wales. Founded in 1978, we have 40 years' experience of helping individuals and community groups to understand and engage with the planning system. Our core services include delivering planning training to a range of audiences, developing easy read planning guidance and a free planning advice helpline. We are the 'go to' organisation for community engagement in planning in Wales; we have built a significant repository of engagement methods, tools and techniques and regularly publish news on good engagement practice.

We recognise LDP preparation is an important avenue for securing more effective public involvement in planning; our current business plan identifies LDP review as one of the three elements in the planning process on which we focus our engagement efforts.

Planning Aid Wales is an advocate of meaningful community engagement in planning. Through our work, we seek to raise the knowledge and capacity of communities to engage, but not just in the activity at hand - we seek to enable people to effectively participate in planning activities on an ongoing basis.

As an independent third party organisation, we have found time and again that communities are willing to engage with us, even where Local Planning Authorities have encountered barriers to engagement in the past. As part of our process, we encourage active collaboration between Local Planning Authority staff and community groups, thereby building better relationships for future engagement. We take no view on any local policy or specific development; we only support individuals and communities to express their own views effectively.

We recognise that the planning system can be complex and the needs / wants of communities do not always align with other interests. We manage expectations by helping our beneficiaries understand that planning is a holistic system that seeks to address a wide variety of priorities, and clearly explain the scope and limitations of what the planning system (or particular activity) can achieve.

Planning Aid Wales is a 'not for profit' body; any income generated from our work is utilised to further support our aims of facilitating greater community engagement in planning across Wales.

### **3. Community and Town Council Preferred Strategy Engagement Events**

Two events were held:

1. 14 January 2019 2pm – 4pm at The Archives Building, Prendergast, Haverfordwest.
2. 21 January 2019 5.30pm – 7.30pm at Pembrokeshire County Council, County Hall, Haverfordwest.

#### **14 January 2019 2pm – 4pm at The Archives Building, Prendergast, Haverfordwest.**

The event was attended by 14 delegates from CTCs, the attendance list is included at Appendix 1 of this report. In addition, 4 members of the Council's Planning Policy Team were in attendance.

Sara Morris, Development Plans and Conservation Manager introduced the afternoon event. Together with other members of the planning policy team, Sara delivered a presentation on the current draft Preferred Strategy, Rural Facilities Study and Candidate Sites. It was briefly explained how the Rural Facilities Study was calculated and also that 457 candidate sites had been received. Although these sites had been initially colour coded (red, yellow and green for residential sites and grey for other sites), it was confirmed that no decision had currently been made on these sites to date and analysis was still required.

At the end of the presentation a question and answer sessions took place and a number of issues raised. These are detailed in the issues section of this report.

PAW introduced themselves and their role in the event. 45 minutes was allocated for the break out groups to consider the two issues.

Delegates were divided into 3 groups to reflect the area of their Council. One member of the Council's Planning Policy team was allocated to each group to note comments on flip charts. These papers would then be collected at the end of each session by PAW to list the issues in this report.

The first break out session looked at the Rural Facilities Study. Given the time available delegates were asked to look at the results for their particular community and advise if they agreed with the findings and if there were any discrepancies. The results are provided in the issues section of the report.

The second break out session considered the candidate sites. Each group considered the sites relevant to their particular area. Delegates were asked to look at the submitted sites and make any comments both positive and negative to the proposals. PAW participated with each group to listen to the discussions and also to pose queries to facilitate views to be made.

The event concluded with PAW repeating the deadline of 4.30 pm on 4 February 2019 for comments on the draft Preferred Strategy, Candidate Sites and Rural Facilities Study. It was emphasised that this was effectively the last chance to provide meaningful comments to influence the LDP as once the document moves to deposit and examination there is little opportunity for change.

**21 January 2019 5.30pm – 7.30pm at Pembrokeshire County Council, County Hall, Haverfordwest.**

The event was attended by 24 delegates from CTCs, the attendance list is included at Appendix 1 of this report. In addition, 5 members of the Council's Planning Policy Team were in attendance and Cllr. Phil Baker (Cabinet Member for Planning and Infrastructure).

Cllr. Baker introduced the evening event. Together with other members of the planning policy team, Sara Morris delivered a presentation on the current draft preferred strategy, Rural Facilities Study and Candidate Sites. It was briefly explained how the Rural Facilities Study was calculated and also that 457 candidate sites had been received. Although these sites had been initially colour coded (red, yellow and green for residential sites and grey for other sites), it was confirmed that no decision had currently been made on these sites to date and analysis was still required.

At the end of the presentation a question and answer sessions took place and a number of issues raised. These are detailed in the issues section of this report.

PAW introduced themselves and their role in the event. 60 minutes was allocated for the break out groups to consider the two issues.

Delegates were divided into 4 groups to reflect the area of their Council. One member of the Council's Planning Policy team was allocated to each group to note comments on flip charts. These papers would then be collected at the end of each session by PAW to list the issues in this report.

The first break out session looked at the Rural Facilities Study. Delegates were asked to look at the results for their particular community and advise if they agreed with the findings and if there were any discrepancies. The results are provided in the issues section of the report. A plenary session was coordinated by PAW at the end of this break out group to explore the principle of classification system. The comments/ issues raised are included in the issues section of this report.

The second break out session considered the candidate sites. Each group considered the sites relevant to their particular area. Delegates were asked to look at the submitted sites and make any comments both positive and negative to the proposals. PAW participated with each group to listen to the discussions and also to pose queries to facilitate views to be made.

The event concluded with PAW repeating the deadline of 4.30 pm on 4 February 2019 for comments on the draft Preferred Strategy, Candidate Sites and Rural Facilities Study. It was emphasised that this was effectively the last chance to provide meaningful comments to influence the LDP as once the document moves to deposit and examination there is little opportunity for change.

## 4. Issues Raised

**14 January 2019 2pm – 4pm at The Archives Building, Prendergast, Haverfordwest.**

Preferred Strategy Question and Answer Session

The issues raised are identified below, the Council did respond on the day to the comments raised and these are included in red following the question.

- Social Housing is not affordable housing due to low incomes of residents. There is a need for housing policies to address this difference. **This is a matter being looked into by the Council.**
- What is classed as affordable housing? There is the Welsh Government definition. **Social rented housing would be part of affordable housing as would low cost home ownership (70% market value). The issue of staircasing needs to be considered. The Council's current approach is based on their SPG which will be looked at again.**
- Banks will not lend in a similar way on affordable housing. There is still an issue of finding a deposit for low cost ownership due to prices. **Comment noted**
- With regard to population growth allowing for more growth than national suggestion is positive. However, there is a need to look at age profile, economic impacts such as jobs. With regard to the points system one-point can make a difference. Could growth not be allowed on borderline cases as this would stimulate growth and development e.g. schools could benefit with numbers. **Comment noted.**
- Consideration to allocations for rural enterprises that are non-farming and outside settlements e.g. fisheries, farmers and horsiculture. Reference to Welsh **Government paper and TAN 6 in relation to rural enterprise dwellings and affordable housing if use ceases.**
- Empty buildings – why can't the Council renovate these and raise income by converting to flats. **Comment noted.**
- What is the difference between urban and other designations? Does urban mean carte blanche to build. There implications for towns such as infrastructure needed to go with it. Also, no jobs within the towns. **The position regarding the definitions used for settlements was explained.**
- With regard to employment there is a need to consider the quality of the employment. **Comment noted.**
- Is there still a chance of a joint LDP with Ceredigion. **Confirmed no.**
- Consideration for over 65 year olds housing and allow for downsizing. Increase to over 70 years old. **No response required.**
- Consideration to encourage local builders, most from outside the area such as big housebuilders. Local builders do not have budgets to compete on such large sites. **Comment noted**
- Care accommodation appears to be dominated by one provider why is this? **Comment noted**

## Break Out Session - 1 Rural Facilities Study

- Llangwm does have a creche.
- Maddox Moor sewerage works.
- Lower Freystop public house has closed.
- Freystop public house closed. There is Gain Chapel.
- Little Honeyborough has a bus route.
- Barnlake has a bus route.
- Scoring of village services – varied provision.
- Merlins Bridge question – Haverfordwest link? (*Comment this appears to relate to where does one end and other start the point was raised in candidate sites comments on the meeting on 21 January 2019.*)
- Happy with amended scoring – village green points? (Lamphey Velfrey)
- Services such as barbers shop / hairdressers should these contribute to assessment?
- Mobile library updates?
- Narberth? (*Comment this may be related to previous discussion relating to what type of settlement Narberth is*)
- Borderline settlements – Flexibility in approach in approach in these locations.

## Break Out Session 2 - Candidate Sites

### **Maddox Moor/ Hook**

- Maddox Moor – Small Settlement (s/s) Large green site. Hook – Service Village Large green site. Which is going to create more points. It is also a green wedge between the two communities. Also, site with mine workings and problem sewer.
- General point – should candidate sites immediately bordering existing settlements score higher than remoter sites? If accepting a bordering site (external) candidate site will this entail a formal boundary review.

### **Llangwm**

- Three sites approved by the Community Council
  - a. New school site – concept of 10? Affordable eco houses (owned by PPC Company). Brilliant concept.
  - b. Old school site owned by Lawrenny Estate/Brownfield site (P.C.C.) – Great for development and expansion of village. NOTE: Issue of access either side of old school – one-way system? Demolition of old school will cause concern although building is in a very poor state. Keep façade as a compromise.
  - c. Small site – No issue with one or two houses.

### **Neyland**

- Site 108 – a good site for affordable housing. Close to bus route, public house and shops.

### **Narberth**

- Speed limit Redstone Cross. Narberth School to Penblewyn.
- Footpath link form Station to Narberth Town to south (Not Jessie Road).
- Jessie Road bus stop has no designated bus bay. Bus therefore does not stop.
- Why isn't housing on Jessie Road shown on the O.S. map.

### **Lamphey**

- Support for mixed use 132 to help parking problems in the village – Prioritise this site.
- Land south east out? Keen to keep Lamphey a small village.
- Site 200. Phase development. Favour of hierarchy.
- Site 197 is ok.

### **Tavernspite**

- Self catering policy questionable – huge development west Tavernspite – disproportionate to the village.
- Control over social landlords renting affordable housing.
- Migrants taking affordable housing.
- Site 134 – Highway objection – very dangerous junction.
- Footpath – New development not contributing to footways, making walking very dangerous.

**21 January 2019 5.30pm – 7.30pm at Pembrokeshire County Council, County Hall, Haverfordwest.**

### Preferred Strategy Question and Answer Session

- Was the local plan and associated evidence for the basis of the plan based on a hard or soft Brexit? **Soft based on the analysis provided by consultants.**
- How does the draft plan sit with the National Park? Would the National Park have any impact upon Pembrokeshire County Council targets? **Projections for the National Park is a declining population. National Park are looking to challenge the no need conclusion. PCC are looking at what needs to be provided to sit alongside the National Park.**

- What is the split of the proposed 425 dwellings? **Assessment will be carried out on housing need and how this will feed into the plan and how the figure will be split.**
- Would the Council refuse planning permission for larger houses if they are not needed and not for affordable houses? **Work is being undertaken on this issue.**
- The increase in 65+ age group is this a result of existing population or population coming in? **The matter will be looked into.**
- What will the population be in 2033? **Reference was made to the presentation slide and possibly circa 130,000. Pembrokeshire as a whole will decline 2021/2023. The plan area will see continued growth albeit slower than now.**
- Loss of young people and increase in older population but is it migration or already here? **Comment noted as above.**
- Haverfordwest is clogged up with traffic. Question the principle of not developing in villages which do not meet services. Increase in population would allow an increase in services. **The preferred 60/40 split is seen to address this. The consultation considers 50/50 and respondents can respond on this point. The answer was given in response to this question and the next two.**
- Could greenfield sites such as at Waterston – 60 acre Govt. owned site not be a candidate site. **As per previous point.**
- Haverfordwest has 1000 homes not built in last 4 years!. **As per previous point.**
- Fundamental flaw in LDP process as the process does not allow local builders to develop. Large housebuilders hold onto land. **PCC is looking at small/medium sites and also self build sites.**
- Implications of the Wellbeing and Future Generations Act, this is more than housing e.g. existing infrastructure is insufficient. Equalities impact assessment – impact on all groups. **Section 106 agreements have an impact on this point, opportunities such as open space provision for example.**
- Develop 2200 jobs, but what are Council doing to ensure high quality jobs. **Research currently looking at broader economic study.**
- Is there an empty homes strategy? **PCC has such a strategy.**
- Any Council housebuilding? **Yes Housing Revenue account back form Government. Programme roles out next year,**
- How to bring large sites forward – Slade Lane? How can the Planning Committee stop just rolling sites forward and renewing permissions when developers are sitting on them. **In relation to large sites answered previously.**
- Explain where and how supporting infrastructure comes into sustainable development and allocations.

#### Break Out Session 1 - Rural Facilities Study

- Abercych has a mobile post office every week for 2 hours but few people use it. No public transport. No work for young people, less than minimum wage.

Low number of Welsh speakers. WWTW capacity is zero. There is access to banking if people turn up.

- St Dogmaels. 50+ PA's. Fighting for a bus service. Sewers beyond capacity. No creche closed last year. Extra housing problems with parking in tariff season. Flooding issues, NRW discrepancies. Mobile post offices. Square and Compass.
- Newchapel. Happy with scoring. Closure of GP services, travel to important services. OPD contributing to land banking.
- Llanstadwell Community inc. Llanstadwell, Mascle Bridge, Waterston & Little Honeyborough. See table in Appendix 2. This shows existing number of facilities and not weighting. Corrections are needed for these settlements. Should be weighting/ scoring which reflects distance to employment e.g. Waterston. Exclusion zone still in force? Brownfield sites have weighting. Water Treatment works having problems even though exists at Llanstadwell. More weighting for GPs. Huge surgeries – more surgeries needed and should be supported with development away from the main towns.
- Other issues how far from a post office 7-mile radius? What is close enough? Second home issue – Welsh Language.
- Access should points be deducted on hierarchy due to poor access or only 1 main route through the town/ village as opposed to multiple accesses. Scale this into the hierarchy.
- Mines/kilns should be factored into the hierarchy – prevent land coming forward.
- Limited parking prevents facilities being used has a bearing on development of a settlement.
- Second holiday home impact upon a villages.
- Build in Welsh Language use and support for this.
- Some of the Councillors thought that consideration should be given to the availability of jobs / workplaces in or close to settlements.
- Some of the Councillors intend to check the scores for settlements facilities / services within their areas and may provide comments to the Council.

## Plenary Discussion

- In relation to the scoring system is there a consideration for the difference between mobile services and permanent such as post offices? How often are mobile ones used. One experience was if they are late nobody uses them.
- In some areas it was considered that the sewerage system cannot cope.
- Some settlements not classed as suitable for development but if they could have some development they may protect or enhance services.

## Break Out Session 2 - Candidate Sites

- There was concern that some settlements that are likely to receive allocations (for instance for housing) in LDP 2 might not have the infrastructure to support a significant scale of further development.
- There was also concern regarding specific aspects of the current infrastructure provision, for instance the nature and capacity of the road network in the Haverfordwest and Merlins Bridge area.
- Some Councillors wanted assurances that existing commitments (planning permissions) would be taken into account before further allocations were made. *PO confirmed that this would be the case.*
- The incidence of second homes and holiday homes and their impact on housing supply and on the nature of communities is an ongoing concern. However, it was understood by Councillors that the planning system in its current form offers limited scope to address this issue.
- One Councillor was concerned that insufficient provision of affordable housing for young Welsh speaking people might force them to leave the area.

### **Brawdy**

- One Councillor pointed out that on cessation of MoD operations, there are covenants in place requiring that the land be offered back to the previous landowners (or their descendants) at current market price – and possibly restrictions on future uses.

### **Haverfordwest**

- There was general concern over the delivery of big housing sites, with the Slade Lane sites at Haverfordwest a focus of those concerns. It was suggested that alternative / smaller sites not owned by major developers should be allocated for housing. However, the Slade Lane site was in the hands of local landowners when first allocated for housing and was subsequently purchased (in part at least) by a major company.
- There was much discussion regarding where Haverfordwest ends and Merlins Bridge begins. Merlins Brook is thought to provide the formal dividing line between Haverfordwest Town Council's area and that of the neighbouring Merlins Bridge Community Council.
- One Councillor suggested that where a housing site adjoins a main road, access should, if possible, come indirectly from nearby minor roads, with the main road boundary vegetation (trees, hedgebanks) left intact.

### **Tiers Cross**

- Councillors were concerned that without having the detail of exactly what is being proposed for each Candidate Site, it would be difficult to make meaningful comments. Several proposals around this village are for housing development, but there is no detail of what sort of housing development available to the Community Council.

### **Abercych**

- Site 314 rejected in the last UDP, Flooding and design, Designated or SSSI – AONB. Rare species – flora and fauna.
- Site 088 No comment.
- Site opposite village hall 80 mixed. No infrastructure.
- Carregwen. 5 Plots.

### **Hook**

- Site 266 – Maddox Moor – would join two villages stretches village out too much. Not supported.
- Site 268- Land is marshy / boggy. Access issues on narrow road Mining maps are not accurate and not mapped. Needs careful consideration as a wider issue across plan area.

### **Llanstadwell**

- Summary of written comments provided by delegate, enclosed at appendix 3.
- Site 254 – Farmland – Above Church (access)?
- Site 298 – Hazelbank (who owns site?) PCC site been ongoing for 50 years.
- Site 253 – Behind 254. Is orange but would be the access point for green coloured site 254.
- Site 252 – Farmland Leonardston Road.
- Site049 – Leonardston House.
- Waterston Road x 2 – Both sites are contaminated land (Kerosene). One is with a public footpath.
- Sites 108, 464, 465, 466 – All farmland owned by same as 253 & 254.
- When will Waterston by-pass occur.
- GN3 – Re Section 106 details.

### **Masclle Bridge**

- Landowner also owns grey sites.

### **Pembroke Dock**

- Sites 444, 446, 447-449 – All be designated to protect their existing open space.
- Site 446 – Leisure/open space.
- Site 445 – Support as categorised.

- Sites 322 & 327 – Want to change use and split golf course, proposed by golf course. Concerned about carving up of the golf course.

### **Waterston**

- By-pass needed. Large heavy lorries affecting drains and residents close to road. Needed before new development agreed.

### **General points**

- Individual development around Haven – Settlements should be scored positively because of closeness of jobs.
- Transport to Cardiff on public transport not good enough.
- Pembrokeshire needs to be more sustainable. Local agriculture to support local economy.

### **Begelly**

- Site 100 – Drainage and Flooding.

### **Cold Blew**

- Private Sewage.

### **East Williamston**

- Subsidence due to mining E Village.
- Site 222 – School Access objection.
- Site 312 – Access?
- Protection of green space. Village green.

### **Pentlepoir**

- Pentlepoir population is too low.
- Site 395 – Covenant for agricultural use? (*Comment: It is understood that the Council will look into this matter*).
- Bonville Courts mines.
- Playground by school protected?
- Accident spot on junction.
- Site 396 – More housing will add to highway issues on junction.

**APPENDIX 1**

Event 14 January 2019

---

Council Name	Councillor Name
Neyland Town Council	Cllr Adam Pollard-Powell
Narberth Town Council	Cllr Sue Rees
St Davids City Council	Heidi Gray (Clerk) & Jessica Foster (Deputy Clerk)
Llangwm Community Council	Cllr Elizabeth Rawlings
Merlin's Bridge Community Council	Cllr Alison Palmer
Freystrop Community Council	Cllr Dawn Harries and Cllr David Thomas
Lamphey Community Council	Cllr Jenny Vince
Lampeter Velfrey Community Council	Cllr Carol Wilson, Cllr Marion Bowden
Solva Community Council	Cllr Vicky Barker
Pembroke Dock Town Council	Cllr Goff Mayor
Fishguard & Goodwick Town Council	Councillor Sharon McCarney
Rudbaxton Community Council	Cllr Brian Gillinder
	Total

Event 21 January 2019

Council Name	Councillor Name	Number attending	LDP Area	Officer Group
Tiers Cross Community Council	Cllr Blaise Bullimore and Cllr Eirian Jones	2	Mid	Bob Smith
Haverfordwest Town Council	Cllr Jon Collier and Cllr Peter Lewis	2	Mid	Bob Smith
Brawdy Community Council	Cllr Gill Lawrence	1	North	Bob Smith
Solva Community Council	Cllr Ifor Thomas	1	North	Charlotte Harding
Llanrhian Community Council	Cllr Brigit Thurstan	1	North	
St Dogmaels Community Council	Sue Davies (Clerk)	1	North East	Charlotte Harding
Manordeifi Community Council	Cllr Alan Wilson and Cllr Margerry Sullivan	2	North East	
Pembroke Town Council	Cllr Chris Doyle	1	South	Julie Kirk
Kilgetty-Begelly Community Council	Cllr Paul Wyatt & Cllr Sandra Smith	2	South East	Emma Evans
East Williamston Community Council	Cllr A Ratcliffe, Cllr G Soar and Cllr I Wilkinson	3	South East	
Penally Community Council	Cllr Mike Neal	1	South East	
Saundersfoot/St Mary Out Liberty/Penally	Melanie Priestley (Clerk)	1	South East	
Llanstadwell Community Council	Cllr Geoff Wilson, Cllr Judith Wilson and Cllr Brynley Evans	3	South West	Julie Kirk
Hook Community Council	Cllr Jeff Sutton	1	South West	
Pembroke Dock Town Council	Cllr Sephen O'Conner	1	South	Julie Kirk

Total	23
-------	----

Please Tick (attendees)
2
2
1
1
1
1
2
0
2
1
1
1
3
1
1

20
----

	Totals by area	Officer Group	Actual
North	4	Bob/Charlotte	3
North East	3	Charlotte Harding	3
South East	7	Emma Evans	5
South	2	Julie Kirk	1
South West	4		4
Mid	4	Bob Smith	4
Total	24		20

**APPENDIX 2**

LDP RURAL FACILITIES SURVEY - AMENDMENTS FOR LOWER FREYSTROP & MADDOX MOOR

Settlements	Population	Weighted score of service Provision	Top Level Services					Prime Services (2 points)					Additional services (1 point)						Hierarchy Level
			Local Store (5 points)	Infant / Primary School (5 points)	Community Hall / Meeting Place (3 points)	Frequent Bus service (3 points)	Daily Train Service (3 points)	Post Office	Creche / Playgroup	GP Surgery	Pharmacy	Public House / Club	Children's Playground / sports area	Place of Worship	Irregular public transport	Village Green / Common Land	Permanent / Mobile Library	Sewerage Connection	
Barnlake	48	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Sutton	48	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Llanmill	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Penffordd	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Bentllass	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Liddeston	54	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
New Moat	57	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Lianteg Park	58	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Llwncelyn	81	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Walton East	97	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
Cuffern	111	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not Defined
New Inn	-	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Rhoscrowther	11	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Llys-y-Fran	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Postgwyn	15	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Welsh Hook	26	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Tufton	26	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Poyston Cross	28	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Rhos-Hill	30	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Treffynon	31	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Wolfsdale	32	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Llanychaer	32	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Little Honeyborough	33	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Woodstock	37	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Uzmaston	37	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Llanfyrnach	43	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Llandeloy	44	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
St Nicholas	44	8	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Bethesda	44	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Deerland	45	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Lower Freystrop	51	86	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Glandwr	60	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Pen-y-Cwm	61	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
St Twynells	64	9	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Pont-yr-Hafod	65	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Bridell	68	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Maddox Moor	72	85	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Gumfreston	73	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village
Castlemorris	73	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Local Village

LDP RURAL FACILITIES SURVEY - AMENDMENT FOR FREYSTROP

Settlements	Population	Weighted score of service Provision	Top Level Services						Prime Services (2 points)				Additional services (1 point)						Hierarchy Level
			Local Store (5 points)	Infant / Primary School (5 points)	Community Hall / Meeting Place (3 points)	Frequent Bus service (3 points)	Daily Train Service (3 points)	Post Office	Creche / Playgroup	GP Surgery	Pharmacy	Public House / Club	Children's Playground / sports area	Place of Worship	Irregular public transport	Village Green / Common Land	Permanent / Mobile Library	Sewerage Connection	
Puncheston	134	18	0	5	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	
East Williamston	146	10	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Llanddwi Velfrey	147	19	5	0	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	
Summerhill	152	12	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Croesgoch	158	18	0	5	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	
Tegryn	162	16	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	
Burton	164	10	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	
Tiers Cross	165	11	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	
Boncath	175	22	5	0	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	
Eglwysrw	177	24	5	5	3	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	
Waterston	208	11	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	
Aberych	209	13	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	
Jeffreyton	214	24	5	5	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	
Wolfscastle	217	25	5	5	3	3	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	
Hermon	218	20	0	5	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	
Blaenffos	224	17	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	
Tavernspite	256	19	0	5	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Keeston	271	10	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	
Freystrop	285	14	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	
Maenclochog	302	27	5	5	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Spittal	332	20	0	5	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Llanstadwell	337	11	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	
Simpson Cross	338	11	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
Llandissilio	345	28	5	5	3	3	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	
New Hedges	349	22	5	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	
Hundleton	351	17	0	5	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	
Clarbeston Road	356	19	0	0	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	
Rosemarket	458	15	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	
Roch	469	26	5	5	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	
Cosheston	490	15	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	
Begelly	561	20	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	
Clunderwen	587	26	5	0	3	3	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	
Templeton	659	22	0	5	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	
Carew/ Sageston	665	24	5	5	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	
Penally	676	23	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	
St. Florence	680	27	5	5	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	
Crundale	695	16	5	0	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Hook	915	29	5	5	3	3	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	

**APPENDIX 3**

# SUMMARY

	LLAN	WATER	M.B	L.H.	
RESIDENTS	337	208	135	33	713
SCOPE OF PROVISION	11	11	8	5	
LOCAL STORE	0	0	0	0	
* COMMUNITY HALL	(1) 0	(1) 0	(1) 0	0	
* BUS SERVICE	3 x (1)	3 x (1)	3 x (1)	3 x (0)	BUS SERVICE 2 EACH HOUR
TRAIN	0	0	0	0	
POST OFFICE	0	0	0	0	
CRECHE	0	0	0	0	
GP SURGERY	0	0	0	0	
PHARMACY	0	0	0	0	
* PUBLIC HOUSE	2 x (1)	0	0	0	
* PLAYGROUND	2 x (1)	2 x (1)	0	0	JORDANSTON HAS. BOTH CLOSED COULD BE FACTO?
WORSHIP	1	1 x	0	0 x (1)	
PUBLIC TRANSPORT	1	0	1	0	
VILLAGE GREEN / COMMON LAND	0	1	0	1	
MOBILE LIBRARY	0	0	0	0	
SEWAGE CONNECT	1	1	1	0	PUMPING STATIONS
* WATER TREATMENT	1	0 x (1)	1	0	
SCHOOL	0	0	0	0	

MISSING OFF SUMMARY IN LLANSTADWELL COMMUNITY

SETTLEMENTS - JORDANSTON -  
CROSSWAYS