

---

**PREFERRED STRATEGY  
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – SCRUTINY TASK & FINISH GROUP**

---

**Reason for the Report**

1. To formally present the draft report of the cross committee scrutiny inquiry into the Council's Preferred Strategy for its Local Development Plan (LDP).
2. To seek endorsement by the Policy Review & Performance Scrutiny Committee.

**Background**

3. Following the deposit of Cardiff's LDP in April 2009, the Plan was submitted to the Welsh Assembly Government for Examination in November 2009. However in view of significant concerns raised by the Inspectors examining the Plan, and following agreement from the Welsh Assembly Government, the Council withdrew the LDP from the Examination in March 2010 and commenced work on preparing a new Plan following the Inspector's report.
4. The Inspector found that the housing proposals were not achievable given: the strategy's 100% reliance on a brownfield sites; it did not deliver a range and choice of dwelling types; it was unlikely to achieve its 40% target for social housing provision; and it was not supported by a credible evidence base. The Inspector's report also identified a lack of provision for Gypsy and traveller accommodation.
5. Scrutiny has considered Council's progress towards securing an LDP at each stage of the Plan's development. Each time consideration has been via a task and finish group of volunteers from all five scrutiny committees. This Preferred

Strategy has been scrutinised by a representative and politically proportional task group including the five Scrutiny Chairs and Members from each of the scrutiny committees. The task group reports formally to the Policy Review & Performance Scrutiny Committee.

6. The terms of reference for the inquiry were:

*To scrutinise the Preferred Strategy for the preparation of the LDP against the ten tests of soundness.*

***Procedural Tests***

*Prepared in accordance with the Delivery Agreement including the Community Involvement scheme*

- *Plan and policies have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal including Strategic Environmental Assessment*

***Consistency Tests***

- *It is a land use plan that has regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or adjoining areas*
- *It has regard to national policy*
- *It has regard to the Wales Spatial Plan*
- *It has regard to the Community strategy*

***Coherence and Effectiveness Tests***

- *The plan sets out a coherent strategy from which its policies and allocations flow and, where cross boundary issues are relevant, it is compatible with the development plans prepared by neighbouring authorities*
- *The strategy, policies and allocations are realistic and appropriate having considered the relevant alternatives and are founded on a robust and credible evidence base*
- *There are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring*

*It is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.*

7. Members of the task and finish group were:

**Community & Adult Services Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Ramesh Patel

Councillor Eleanor Sanders

Councillor Kirsty Davies

**Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Siobhan Corria

Councillor Chris Davis

**Economy & Culture Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Craig Williams

Councillor Phil Hawkins

**Environmental Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Bob Derbyshire (Joint Chair)

Councillor Gareth Aubrey

Councillor Rod McKerlich

Councillor Jacqueline Parry

**Policy Review & Performance Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Elizabeth Clark (Joint Chair)

Councillor Gary Hunt

Councillor Paul Mitchell

Councillor Adrian Robson

8. The task and finish group met on four occasions between July and September 2012 and received evidence from a wide range of internal and external witnesses.

**Internal Witnesses:**

- Councillor Ralph Cook - Cabinet Member Strategic Planning, Highways, Traffic & Transportation
- James Clemence - Operational Manager, Planning Policy
- Phil Williams - Operational Manager, Strategic Planning & Development Management

- Paul Carter - Operational Manager, Transport Strategy & Projects
- Ken Poole - Operational Manager, Economy & Major Projects
- Stuart Williams - Group Leader, Strategic Policy
- Jason Dixon - Team Leader, Transport Policy
- Mike Friel - Operational Manager, Housing Strategy Advice & Support
- Michelle Brewer - Housing Strategy & Supporting People Manager

#### **External Witnesses**

- Mark Newey - Head of Local Development, Welsh Government
- Mark Barry - M&G Barry Consulting
- Dr Stevie Upton - Research Officer, Institute of Welsh Affairs
- Professor Stuart Cole - Professor of Transport, University of Glamorgan

9. The Preferred Strategy and scrutiny recommendations will be offered for Cabinet consideration prior to full Council on 25 October 2012. Subject to Council approval, work will continue on developing the Deposit Local Development Plan, which is projected to be completed by October 2013. The Local Development Plan regulations require the Council to publish its pre-deposit proposals for public inspection and comment.

#### **Way Forward**

10. Attached at **Appendix A** is the final draft report of the task group. Members are particularly referred to the Context (*pages 21-23*) section of the report, Key Findings (*pages 6-17*), and the eight Recommendations (*pages 18-20*). These are based on the evidence heard throughout the task and finish group Inquiry.
11. Members may wish to consider the report and agree whether to approve the report and refer it for consideration by the Cabinet.

## **Legal Implications**

12. The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not to make policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct legal implications. However, legal implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without any modifications. Any report with recommendations for decision that goes to Cabinet/Council will set out any legal implications arising from those recommendations. All decisions taken by or on behalf the Council must (a) be within the legal powers of the Council; (b) comply with any procedural requirement imposed by law; (c) be within the powers of the body or person exercising powers of behalf of the Council; (d) be undertaken in accordance with the procedural requirements imposed by the Council e.g. Scrutiny Procedure Rules; (e) be fully and properly informed; (f) be properly motivated; (g) be taken having regard to the Council's fiduciary duty to its taxpayers; and (h) be reasonable and proper in all the circumstances.

## **Financial Implications**

13. The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not to make policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct financial implications at this stage in relation to any of the work programme. However, financial implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without any modifications. Any report with recommendations for decision that goes to Cabinet/Council will set out any financial implications arising from those recommendations.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

(i) The Committee is recommended to endorse the task and finish group's report, subject to any comments or amendments the Committee wishes to make, for submission to the Cabinet.

**MIKE DAVIES**

Head of Scrutiny, Performance & Improvement  
26 September 2012



**scrutiny**



---

**A Report of:  
Policy Review & Performance Scrutiny Committee**

**DRAFT**

Local Development Plan 2006-26

**Draft Preferred Strategy**

September 2012



County Council of The City and County of Cardiff

## CONTENTS

<b>CHAIRS' FOREWORD.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>KEY FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
GROWTH.....	6
STRATEGY.....	9
INFRASTRUCTURE.....	10
ECONOMIC.....	14
SOCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL.....	15
<b>KEY RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>KEY EVIDENCE.....</b>	<b>24</b>
GROWTH.....	25
STRATEGY.....	31
INFRASTRUCTURE.....	34
ECONOMIC.....	45
SOCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL.....	50
<b>PROCESS FOR SCRUTINY OF THE PREFERRED STRATEGY.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>REFERENCE/BACKGROUND PAPERS.....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE.....</b>	<b>59</b>



**DRAFT**

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

This report presents the findings and recommendations of the task & finish scrutiny inquiry into the Preferred Strategy for the Local Development Plan 2006-2026. The terms of reference for the inquiry were as follows:

To scrutinise the Preferred Strategy for the preparation of the LDP against the ten tests of soundness.

### **Procedural Tests**

- Prepared in accordance with the Delivery Agreement including the Community Involvement scheme
- Plan and policies have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal including Strategic Environmental Assessment

### **Consistency Tests**

- It is a land use plan that has regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or adjoining areas
- It has regard to national policy
- It has regard to the Wales Spatial Plan
- It has regard to the Community strategy

### **Coherence and Effectiveness Tests**

- The plan sets out a coherent strategy from which its policies and allocations flow and, where cross boundary issues are relevant, it is compatible with the development plans prepared by neighbouring authorities
- The strategy, policies and allocations are realistic and appropriate having considered the relevant alternatives and are founded on a robust and credible evidence base
- There are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- It is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.

Members of the task and finish group were:

**Community & Adult Services Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Ramesh Patel  
Councillor Eleanor Sanders  
Councillor Kirsty Davies

**Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Siobhan Corria  
Councillor Chris Davis

**Economy & Culture Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Craig Williams  
Councillor Phil Hawkins

**Environmental Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Bob Derbyshire (Joint Chair)  
Councillor Gareth Aubrey  
Councillor Rod McKerlich  
Councillor Jacqueline Parry

**Policy Review & Performance Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Elizabeth Clark (Joint Chair)  
Councillor Gary Hunt  
Councillor Paul Mitchell  
Councillor Adrian Robson

## KEY FINDINGS

### GROWTH

#### *Population Projections*

KF1 Growth is inevitable, and the 2011 Census findings, released in July 2012, provide evidence for the Council's decision to recommend "Option B" for growth at this stage in the Preferred Strategy.

KF2 Welsh Government (WG) advises that population projections are based on past trends whereas household projection figures are based on a great number of variables. Local authorities need robust statistical evidence to justify future population and growth projections and how best to accommodate them. Cardiff has used Dr Boden's (Edge Analytics) population projection figures as part of the evidence base to justify deviating from the latest WG projections. The Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) will assess progress of the Local Development Plan and take stock of the figures. The growing city-region dimension might mean that the city takes a different approach for future Plan reviews.

KF3 The population projections are based on the 2008 Household Projections as a baseline. These figures are based on 4,000 births, 3,000 deaths, loss of 300 people due to UK migration and gain of 2,700 due to overseas migration annually. They assume a net inward migration to Cardiff of 2,400 persons per annum between 2006-2026 compared to past rates of 600 persons per annum. Over the 10-year period since the census in 2001 the population has increased by 20,000. whereas between 2011 to 2026 the population of Cardiff is forecast to increase by 61,000. Cardiff will see a 42% rise in population between 2008 and 2033, whilst the Valley authorities will see no more than 5%. There is support from the neighbouring authorities for the Option B level for growth.

KF4 The population and growth projections should be closely monitored due to the rapidly changing situation in key areas. These include;

- The UK government's policy to limit overseas migration
- The new student funding regime
- Increasing unemployment rate in Cardiff
- Fall in UK economic growth
- That the electrification of the Great Western railway will not be implemented until 12 years into the plan period.

### ***Housing Projections***

KF5 Whilst the majority of the group acknowledges that the Council should proceed with Option B, there are varying degrees of reservation about the evidence base for the Option B projected household build.

Some have strong reservations that house building will achieve 2,600 pa as projected because the building projections of neighbouring local authorities with agreed LDPs suggest projections have not been achieved<sup>1</sup>; the proposed build rate of 2,600 houses per annum in Cardiff during economic uncertainty is higher than the build rate achieved of 1,800 houses per annum at the peak of the economic boom; and housing completion rates in Cardiff for the three years prior to 2012 averaged 795 per annum.

Some Members fully supported Option B in light of: expert advice that Option B is the way forward (work undertaken by Dr Boden of Edge Analytics verifies the decision to pursue Option B); past rates of development in the city; the prospect and implications of electrification; a UK shortage of family accommodation; the 11,000 social housing waiting list and 10,000 private renters in Cardiff; and the prospect that the recession will end well before the Plan period ends.

---

<sup>1</sup> RCT LDP 2006-21 allocation 14,385 (959pa), completed 2006-2011/12 = 2,403 (401pa)  
Caerphilly LDP 2006-21 allocation 8,625 (575pa), completed 2006/7-2011/12 = 2,912 (485pa)  
Merthyr Tydfil LDP 2006-21 allocation 3,964 (264pa), completed 2006/7-2011/12 = 1,016 (169pa)

There is an opportunity for phasing projections to synchronise with neighbouring authorities as the City region progresses and infrastructure develops in tandem with house building.

KF6 The household projection figures within the LDP currently align with the most recent Census figures. WG consider the projected figure of 45,000 for new dwellings is a robust stance to take, supported by evidence. However, other stakeholders, such as the Home Builders Federation (HBF) may wish to increase the scale of growth. Re-calibration of household projection figures will inform the Deposit Plan. Option C was found to be the favoured option by the Cardiff Citizen's Panel, representations made, and at public events.

KF7 The M4 is considered a boundary for development it is important to protect.

KF8 The market is a key factor in determining house building in Cardiff. Members were advised that demand strongly influences the acceptability of sites.

KF9 The proposed build rate of 2,600 houses per annum during economic uncertainty is higher than the build rate of 1,800 at the peak of the economic boom, however the projections are not unsound. The justification for these figures is the availability of greenfield sites. The LDP household projection figures must ensure there is sufficient scope to cater for the suppressed demand.

KF10 The Inspector has commented that the previous LDP made provision for the development of brownfield land, and this alone was not enough to fulfil the housing requirement, and deliver a range and choice of housing. The Joint Housing Land Availability Study requires the city to have a five year supply of land for housing, and at present there is only 2.3 years supply.

KF11 Welsh Government feel there are no issues with the headline proposals, and the plan will be based on robust evidence. An important part of

this assessment was the consultancy work undertaken by Edge Analytics with regard to the household projection figures produced by WG. There have been a number of meetings with Ministers who are generally satisfied with the level of growth identified. Their view is that in broad terms the LDP Preferred Strategy is a plan which should get through to an examination and hopefully adoption.

KF12 Demand is for affordable family homes and social housing options are important, however the Council must not impose social housing figures that prevent developers wanting to build. A rate of 40% affordable housing for developments over 10 dwellings is aspirational, Strategic statements rather than percentage figures would be better. Homes built will be based on simple economics and land owners will release land at the right price. One example is a recent brownfield development in the Llanishen area which created 700 new homes that are fully occupied. It is important to build communities, not just housing.

KF13 The City Region will require progressive regional working. Option B should be used as an opportunity to engage in a formal dialogue with neighbouring authorities to support its validity. There is merit in increasing the number of jobs and decreasing the numbers of new homes forecast, allowing neighbouring authorities to take up the housing slack by increasing the jobs available, allowing for increased commuting.

## STRATEGY

KF14 Candidate strategic sites were assessed against 5 factors: *environmental, flood risk, transportation, neighbourhood, community and place making, and infrastructure and deliverability*. It is vital that discussions are ongoing regarding strategic sites as many brownfield sites are not listed and there is no reference to the impact sites will have on neighbouring authorities.

KF15 The Preferred Strategy identifies three new communities for the city, around the areas of Creigiau, Pentrebane and Pontprennau. Extensive master planning will take place to create sustainable communities, and community engagement exercises will help to inform decision making. There will be phased delivery within each site and triggers in place to ensure that the type of development matches population growth. Subject to Council approval on 25 October 2012, dialogue with developers will commence.

KF16 Welsh Government feel the plan has a range and choice of green and brownfield development sites that have a realistic chance of being adopted, though this ultimately is a decision for the Planning Inspector.

## INFRASTRUCTURE

### *Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)*

KF17 The Council will be preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in parallel with preparation of the LDP, and an Infrastructure Plan will be published in tandem with consultation on the Deposit Plan in October 2013.

KF18 The Preferred Strategy has significant implications in terms of infrastructure required to support the proposed development. Transport links, schools provision, social housing and retail are all major considerations. The Council can only put in place infrastructure for which it can secure sufficient funds at the right time.

KF19 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) may or may not assist in providing infrastructure in the City. It also has the potential to help deliver infrastructure outside of the county boundary.



KF20 The proposed strategic sites will potentially place a burden on Cardiff's existing infrastructure, resulting in choke points into the City. The Council recognises the need to create transport hubs and park and ride schemes.

KF21 Brownfield development is popular because it is within existing communities. The CIL could ensure a different levy is placed on brownfield to greenfield development to ensure brownfield remains attractive.

KF22 The Council can still negotiate Section 106<sup>2</sup> agreements and Planning Obligations, but if there is no LDP masterplan in place, the Council cannot refer to the wider area and the Community Infrastructure Levy.

KF23 Welsh Government assumes that housing and transport strategy will be appropriately phased. Whilst finance should align with development, the LDP process lacks clarity regarding funding to support the provision of infrastructure in the plan.

KF24 It is important that the Community Infrastructure Levy generates sufficient funds to support the infrastructure requirements of the development. The money generated through CIL would be better held as one large strategic pot of money, than smaller pots held by each Council department.

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 106 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 allows for Local Planning Authorities and persons interested in land to agree contributions, arrangements and restrictions as *Planning Agreements* or *Planning Obligations*

It relates to monies paid by developers to Local Planning Authorities in order to offset the costs of the external effects of development. For example, if a developer were to build 100 new houses, there would be effects on local schools, roads etc., which the Local Authority would have to deal with. In that situation, there might be a Section 106 agreement as part of the granting of planning permission. The developer might agree to make a contribution towards the provision of new schools or traffic calming on local roads.

## ***Transport***

KF25 There is a need to re-dress the balance between the car and public transport and make it more attractive to use public transport. Alternative modes of transport are required *before* housing units are provided; community facilities need to be within walking distance to negate the use of cars; there is a need for a modal shift; and a regional approach to transportation. To be viable public transport has to be a lot faster form of travel than the private car.

KF26 South East Wales Transport Alliance (SEWTA) has £9 million available annually for funding transport schemes. The Infrastructure Plan should minimise car use and aspire to increase the use of public transport. There is minimal money available for new, improved roads.

KF27 Cardiff is the hub of the public transport network for South East Wales. In this respect Cardiff currently underperforms for the region compared with other large cities that are core to their city regions. South East Wales is undercapitalised, has an ageing infrastructure, and the city region transport infrastructure is hindering investment. A review of all sustainable transport policies is to be encouraged, to include city region aspects, addressing the needs of neighbouring authorities.

KF28 The strategic sites will require the building of highways. There is a need for a link road to the east of Cardiff. Junction 30 of the M4 at Cardiff Gate is operating at capacity during peak times.

KF29 Cardiff's entire rail network will be electrified by 2018. Work is underway to increase capacity at Cardiff Queen Street and Cardiff Central railway stations. The service will become faster, cleaner and more efficient and require reduced maintenance. There is the potential for four carriage trains therefore increasing passenger capacity, and platform extensions should be completed by 2015. With electrification the southern Valleys are easily accessible, passengers from the Valleys will be able to travel into Cardiff faster.

KF30 A circular line linking Coryton and Radyr railway lines would allow cross city link. The line would prove expensive because of the need to build a bridge and there is likely to be no money available before the end of the Plan period.

KF31 Economically the identification of a transport hub is a good concept. Though timing is unclear, the train and bus stations need to be built next to each other to ensure maximum connectivity.

KF32 A *modal shift* occurs when a new form of public transport is introduced. Tram-trains are likely to afford modal shift, as they allow for small spurs from the existing heavy rail line, allowing for shorter journeys and easier access. A Tram-trains trial is currently being piloted in Sheffield. Whilst FTR light railway has been successful in Swansea. Developer contributions could help to achieve the tram-train vision from strategic site developments such as Waterhall in the west of Cardiff. Cardiff has undertaken a survey six to seven years previously, which provided an evidence base for light-rail spurs. A tram-train system will take a lot of funding and political drive, costing approximately £10 to £20 million per mile. Funding for this has not currently been identified.

KF33 In Cardiff rail travel is operated exclusively by Network Rail; in 2018 there will be a new franchise. In both Liverpool and Newcastle the train franchise is specified by the local authority.

KF34 It is imperative that work begins soon on the re-operable rail track-bed in the west of Cardiff extending to Creigiau. Re-opening of the line would be expensive, but the land is available (though unlikely to be built before 2024).

KF35 Whilst political thinking is regionally minded, it is imperative to protect key transport routes, such as the disbanded Creigiau line.

KF36 A great deal of work is required on infrastructure. Parking enforcement in Cardiff is considered poor. The bus corridors approach is fully supported,

however clear enforcement is required especially where cars are parking in bus lanes. New and existing communities need to be brought along with proposals for bus lanes. The infrastructure for many bus routes is already in place. However opportunities exist to introduce bus accessibility in northeast Cardiff by introducing Park and Ride in Lisvane. A new bus priority lane out of Lisvane will help negate congestion. If the development of land between Lisvane and Pontprennau goes ahead a bus lane should be in place before the development is built. A park and ride facility will also be required at the proposed Waterhall strategic site.

## ECONOMIC

KF37 The UK economy is predicted to be in recession until 2016/2017. Wales' share of UK inward investment has fallen to 2%, and South East Wales is bottom of the UK table for regional competitiveness. However, Cardiff's financial, creative, ICT and business sectors are buoyant. Cardiff is in a unique regional position and has 2 options; grow the city alone, or pursue a city region approach. Cardiff is the location developers find attractive.

KF38 To be competitive, there is a need for a critical mass. Transport does not recognise local authority boundaries. The city region is a good way forward. In the short term priority must be given to progressing Cardiff's LDP, however in future LDPs would be best undertaken regionally and Cardiff could take the initiative in this. Local authorities can not allocate land for development in neighbouring authorities.

KF39 The Wales Spatial Plan recognises Cardiff as the driver of the city region. All key strategic documents should aspire to incorporate the city region approach. For example, the "What Matters" document contains '7 outcomes for Cardiff'; scope for regional working could be expressed in an additional outcome.

KF40 Cardiff Council is having an open dialogue with neighbouring authorities, thereby acknowledging the city-region dimension and the need to think regionally wherever possible. Further dialogue to establish the likelihood of neighbouring local authorities meeting their future housing targets could be achieved via the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).

KF41 The Council's job strategy is for significant growth through the enterprise zone near the station, and the provision for up to 1 million square foot of office space. To attract investment, Grade A office space and a ready stock of industrial warehousing that businesses can easily move into needs to be made available as a priority.

KF42 There is a potential commitment from Welsh Government announcing up to 1 million square foot of office space in the city centre enterprise zone that would create 10,000-15,000 new jobs. Inward investment figures should improve over the next 10 years with the promotion of Cardiff focussing on London, the provision of good quality office accommodation, and the development of skills. No date was identified for work to commence.

KF43 The Council's strategy to achieve 40,000 new jobs is not convincing.

KF44 Tourism is a priority sector for the Council and independent analysis has re-affirmed that tourism numbers are increasing. However tourism, and particularly cultural festivals, should be given a higher profile within the Preferred Strategy with more specific reference to tourism in the 'Strategic Policies' section of the LDP Preferred Strategy.

## **SOCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL**

### ***Social***

KF45 Social housing waiting lists are increasing year on year. The Council has placed a priority on affordable housing issues, and has a target of 40%,

but it must be mindful that building social housing on greenfield land will require a strong focus on improving community facilities and should be of a high quality.

KF46 The Council needs to work corporately with the health service to ensure a co-ordinated approach. Members wish to stress the importance of consultation with the Health Authorities in planning communities.

KF47 Creating new estates and communities presents an opportunity for design to address the issue of anti-social behaviour. Walkways or 'links' between housing estates and communities have in the past exacerbated anti-social behaviour. Research is underway to identify best practice examples of successful neighbourhoods in other countries.

KF48 The Council is currently in the process of commissioning a study to examine the need for Gypsy and traveller accommodation, and potential sites to meet this need.

KF49 The appropriate provision needs to be made for the growth in student population.

### ***Environmental***

KF50 There is a potential risk of unsustainable building if land is not released for development. Large areas of green space would remain after the development of the sites proposed in the LDP Preferred Strategy.

KF51 Within the City boundaries it is vitally important to protect green space, in particular the green corridors, given the proposed developments. National policy guidelines state greenfield land per head of population should be 6 hectares per 1000 people. The master planning process will address flooding, biodiversity, river valleys, wildlife, footpaths, cycle paths, rights of way, woodland and open space. Flooding, however, should be given more weight. Specifically section 3.41 should include reference to brooks and small

watercourses. The Landscape Assessment will inform decisions on tree planting.

KF52 More family housing is likely on greenfield land as opposed to brownfield land, and the Council should consider the merits of placing a higher levy on greenfield development.

DRAFT

## RECOMMENDATIONS

R1 The Cabinet is recommended to consider the areas of concern raised by the Scrutiny task and finish group (detailed in Key Finding 5 above) which will require close monitoring, to ensure that the projected levels of growth in Option B (based on 45,400 new homes and 40,000 new jobs) are valid as the Plan is developed and implemented, and to modify as appropriate.

*(Reference KF5, supported by key findings 1-13).*

R2 The Council must be bold, ambitious and proactive in its approach to transport infrastructure, exploring all alternatives to ensure connectivity for the City and its region. The Cabinet is recommended to explore all options from *affordable to aspirational* by:

- proactively considering heavy and light rail solutions,
- proactively seeking funding for new transport solutions,
- meaningfully enforcing bus lanes as a minimum.
- making public transport more accessible by effective advertising and
- ensuring payment methods for different modes of transport are easily transferable.

New modes of transport will lead to a modal shift. From the evidence considered to ensure any new preferred sites are viable Scrutiny wish to highlight three key projects for future network rail development bids for completion well before the end of the plan period: Creigiau to Fairwater; Radyr to Coryton; and a programme of new stations across the City. There needs to be a new bus station next to the Central railway station. Further, it is imperative that the Council protects the desire lines for potential routes to facilitate future transport visions. The task group urges that the appropriate transport infrastructure is secured prior to agreed development taking place.

*(supported by key findings 25-36).*

R3 Core to the Preferred Strategy for Cardiff should be the creation and protection of communities. The Cabinet is recommended in its detailed



planning to address all aspects of community that determine its sustainability, schools, jobs, health services, and retail; learning from experience to design out anti social behavior created by building large estates on isolated greenfield sites. To assist with this the Cabinet is encouraged to engage with appropriate agencies to inform planning and development at the earliest stages; and urged to pay particular attention to these factors when developing the principles of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Full costings of potential Community Infrastructure Levy income need to be made to ensure there is sufficient provision for the necessary infrastructure of any new developments before they are agreed.

*(supported by Key Findings 17-24).*

R4 The economic growth of Cardiff will be influenced by its approach to City Region planning during the Local Development Plan period to 2026. In developing its Preferred Strategy the Cabinet is recommended to:

- continue strong lines of communication with the City's neighbouring authorities;
- further develop its job strategy, retaining a flexible and imaginative approach to attracting/incentivising new business, which will assist with the creation of 40,000 new jobs projected by Option B;
- ensure the economic benefits of tourism are given greater attention in the Preferred Strategy, promoting the City more effectively and developing its competitiveness as a cultural destination.
- provide the necessary impetus to progress the proposed high quality office space in the Enterprise Zone around the central bus and railway station
- make the appropriate provision regarding the impact on communities of the growth in student numbers

*(supported by Key Findings 41, 43, 44, 49)*

R5 The Cabinet is recommended to ensure that the M4 boundary is maintained as a limit for development and to protect the woodland areas and river corridors within Cardiff.

*(supported by Key Finding 7)*

R6 The Cabinet is recommended to continue its examination of the provision of Gypsy and traveller provision to address the concerns of the Planning Inspector, and explore further the merit of a regional approach to provision. *(supported by Key Finding 48)*

R7 Finally the Cabinet is urged to engage in full, open and transparent consultation with local residents as it moves into the detailed planning phase of its Local Development Plan, prior to final deposit.

R8. The Cabinet is requested to keep scrutiny updated of progress on the above recommendations as the LDP process continues.

DRAFT

## CONTEXT

1. The Welsh Government (WG)<sup>3</sup> requires all councils to have a Local Development Plan (LDP). The document is the Council's key land use planning document, which sets out policies and proposals for future development and use of land in Cardiff between 2006 - 2026, in line with legislative requirements. Once adopted the LDP will replace the existing structure and local plans for the city and will form the basis for decisions on individual planning applications.
2. The LDP is a statutory requirement which identifies opportunities for investment and regeneration including the provision of new homes, jobs, community facilities and transport infrastructure. The Plan also identifies land that requires protection for its conservation importance and measures necessary for safeguarding our environment. It needs to balance sustainable development and conservation, whilst delivering the community's vision for the future of Cardiff.
3. In preparing the LDP, the Council must take account of a wide range of legislation, policies and other initiatives at European, national and local levels of government, including:
  - The Wales Spatial Plan
  - South East Wales Transport Alliance (SEWTA) Regional Transport Plan
  - South East Wales Regional Waste Plan
  - South East Wales Regional Technical Statement for Aggregates.
4. The LDP is tasked with:
  - Delivering sustainable development
  - Reflecting local aspirations for the city, based on a vision agreed by the local community and other stakeholders

---

<sup>3</sup> The Planning & Compulsory Order Act 2004

- Providing a basis for rational and consistent development control decisions
  - Guiding growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character and sensitive environments
  - Showing how and where change will occur over the plan period<sup>4</sup>,
5. The Preferred Strategy therefore aims to give a broad outline of the intended level of growth in Cardiff and how it can be sustainably delivered. The strategy is a result of carefully considering a number of different factors including:
- The national and regional policy framework;
  - A sound understanding of the local context- identifying key data and issues which the plan must take account of from the evidence base;
  - The Council's Community Strategy and LDP vision and objectives;
  - Considering the merits of different growth options; and
  - Considering the merits of different spatial options- where the best places are to accommodate new development needs.
6. The Scrutiny inquiry final report will be considered by the Policy Review and Performance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 3 October 2012 and offered for Cabinet consideration prior to full Council on 25 October 2012. Subject to Council approval, work will continue on developing the Deposit Local Development Plan, which is projected to be completed by October 2013. The Local Development Plan regulations require the Council to publish its pre-deposit proposals for public inspection and comment.
7. The previous LDP was withdrawn by the Council in March 2010 following the Inspector's report which had concerns over the Council's lack of provision for households and its sole reliance on brownfield policy. The Inspector found that the housing proposals were not achievable given: the strategy's 100% reliance on a brownfield sites; it did not deliver a

---

<sup>4</sup> Cardiff Local Development Plan – Preferred Strategy Report 2007

range and choice of dwelling types; was unlikely to achieve its 40% target for social housing provision; and was not supported by a credible evidence base. The Inspector's report also identified a lack of provision for Gypsy and traveller accommodation.

8. The Council began work on a new LDP immediately, and during November and December 2010, a consultation and engagement exercise was carried out to inform the LDP's vision and objectives.
  
10. Strategic growth options were prepared in Spring 2011 and three options were then subject to a consultation process including public meetings in May and June 2011. The Council did not consider a "no growth" option as legislation states that options must be realistic and sustainable. With births increasing, people living longer, and net inward migration meant this option was not viable.

11. The three options considered were as follows:

**Option A:** Based on the Welsh Government 2008 based population and household projections.

- Plan will provide for about 54,400 new homes and 55,000 new jobs.

**Option B:** Based on the Welsh Government 2008 based population and household projections but applying locally robust data to recalibrate these trend-led projections.

- Plan will provide for about 45,400 new homes and 40,000 new jobs.

**Option C:** Based on long term past rates of net migration rates and housing completions.

- Plan will provide for about 36,500 new homes and 26,000 new jobs.

## KEY EVIDENCE

The Local Development Plan (LDP) will form the basis of Cardiff's development up to 2026. The Council is currently without an LDP, a position of weakness when considering a planning application that results in a planning appeal. Members were given the example of a recent appeal decision on Michaelston Road, which the Council could not defend due to the absence of a 5-year land supply and an up to date LDP. Production of the Plan is therefore a priority. It is imperative that the Preferred Strategy is considered by Council in October 2012, and the Council is confident of meeting the tight timescale to which the plan is being produced.

At the commencement of the inquiry the task group heard the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning, Highways, Traffic & Transportation had made the unprecedented decision to release a working draft no status copy of the LDP Preferred Strategy ahead of consideration by Cabinet and Council in October 2012. The rationale behind this was that the LDP Preferred Strategy could not be scrutinised effectively without the task & finish group having sight of the document. He felt the Preferred Strategy was founded on evidence and the Council's administration wished to be as transparent and open as possible. The document's public release would also allow Members of the task & finish group to discuss the approach with colleagues across the Council, and therefore enable all Members' comments and observations to inform the Scrutiny.

Members heard that the Operational Manager (Planning Policy) felt Scrutiny of the LDP is crucial to the process, acting as a critical friend as the LDP addresses Cardiff and its region.

The Operational Manager Strategic Planning & Development reminded the group that with only a 2.3 year housing land supply it was difficult to defend planning applications at appeal. Given this he noted that it was important to

progress the adoption of the LDP as soon as possible to strengthen the Council's position should planning applications be received for candidate sites. The group were reminded that with an adopted LDP, the Council would also have a stronger negotiating platform for affordable housing.

At the outset Members of the task & finish group were advised that they should aim not to dwell on specific ward issues, but to look at how the Plan will affect Cardiff more generally.

A strong theme running throughout the inquiry was the robustness of the evidence base for the Preferred Strategy. Members were informed that officers were confident of the evidence on which the plan was based, and there would be more evidence available at a later stage. The task & finish group was made aware that the LDP must be deliverable and founded on a robust evidence base to ensure a sound plan.

## **GROWTH**

### ***Population Projections***

- Members heard that growth was inevitable regardless of the option chosen.
- The task group explored how confident the Council was of the accuracy of the 2011 Census figures, in light of the 2001 Census figures for Cardiff's population being underestimated. The Cabinet Member Strategic Planning, Highways Traffic & Transportation confirmed that the 2011 Census findings, released in July 2012, supported the Council's decision to select "Option B" for growth.
- Members were advised by Mark Newey, Head of Local Development, Welsh Government that population figures are trend based, which is why they form the starting point and are not set in stone. In addition the household projection figures are based on a great number of variables. If

local authorities did not identify greenfield development where there was strong evidence to indicate this was required it could have negative connotations for the local economy.

- Members enquired what would happen if the WG population projections were to fall suddenly. They heard that local authorities need strong statistical evidence to understand where the projections are going and how best to accommodate them, or not. In Cardiff's case it should be about refinement and minor adjustments as opposed to large changes.
- The WG latest population and household projections form the starting point when preparing a LDP, although local authorities can deviate from the projections provided this is supported by robust evidence. Cardiff has used Dr Boden's (Edge Analytics) population projection figures as part of the evidence base to justify deviating from the latest WG projections.
- Members highlighted that over the 10-year period since the Census in 2001 the population had increased by 20,000, whereas between 2011 to 2026 the population of Cardiff is forecast to increase by 61,000.
- The task & finish group was advised that the population projections were based on a baseline figure from 2008 and assumed a net inward migration of 2,400 persons per annum compared to past rates of 600 persons per annum.
- The task & finish group enquired about the public responses to the three growth options, notably 70%+ in favour of option C. The task & finish group was made aware that indeed the general public had been in favour of option C, but the plan must meet the "10 Tests of Soundness" and there has to be a range and choice of sites available.
- Members questioned the reliability of the Office for National Statistics (ONS) figures, and also the growth figure options of the Edge Analytics



report used to inform the Council's selection of Option B. If the figures had been underestimated where would the plan stand? The group were made aware that ONS figures are generally accurate, and subject to independent analyses. The task group was advised that the author of the Edge Analytics report sits on the independent board and that the Census figures reaffirmed the report's household projection figures. Finally, the group were made aware of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which will monitor the implementation of the LDP, including dwelling completions, and trigger a review of the Plan should circumstances change significantly.

- The Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) will assess the Plan and take stock of the figures. The growing city-region dimension might mean that the city takes a different approach for future Plan reviews.
- Members explored what factors would cause Cardiff to grow up to 2026. The group was made aware that births are exceeding deaths and this alone will mean the city will grow. There are younger people living in the city, such as students, leading to inward economic migration.
- The task group explored the growth of Cardiff relative to surrounding authorities, particularly the Vale of Glamorgan, Rhondda Cynon Taff and Caerphilly, and how growth would emerge. The group was advised that the anticipated growth in Cardiff will see a 42% rise in population between 2008-2033, whilst the Valley authorities will see no more than 5%. 46% of growth in the region stems from Cardiff. Both Rhondda Cynon Taf and Caerphilly Councils have published WG approved LDPs. The group heard that Caerphilly Council's LDP is split to accommodate their diverse county.
- Finally the group was reminded that there was support from the neighbouring authorities for the Option B level for growth.

### ***Housing Projections***

- The group heard that the household projection figures within the LDP align perfectly with the most recent Census figures.
- The task group was advised that the WG population and household projections are not purely used for planning purposes, which is why Planning Policy Wales (PPW) refers to them as being the starting point, enabling deviation supported by evidence. The technical work undertaken by Dr Boden (Edge Analytics, Household Projection figures) on behalf of the Council was considered to be robust and has been cited to Wrexham Council as an example of the type of evidence required to support deviation. Members heard that WG consider the projected figure of 45,000 for new dwellings is a robust stance to take, supported by evidence. However, other stakeholders, such as the Home Builders Federation (HBF) may wish to increase the scale of growth. WG understand that developers are not currently submitting planning applications in Cardiff due to the difficulty in gaining the appropriate finance from head offices, primarily due to land not being allocated in an adopted LDP and therefore the risk is too great.
- Those in communal living, such as students, are calculated by an allowance included in the population and household projections, which inform the LDP growth options.
- Members enquired whether re-calibration of household projection figures, particularly communal establishments, and the increased age of the population with people living longer, would be carried out post publication of the Preferred Strategy. The group were made aware that re-calibration would inform the Deposit Plan. More affluent, older people were tending to move to surrounding authorities such as Monmouthshire and the Vale of Glamorgan.

- Members were concerned about how far the City can grow and where growth of the City ends. Officers reassured the group that there is sufficient slack in the figures, but the Council must be aware that house builders will push for greater growth. In addition Members emphasised the importance of the M4 as a boundary for development, they felt it is a good buffer for development and therefore it is important to protect.
- The task group highlighted the building of new homes, enquiring whether the number of new houses built determines the population of Cardiff. For example, if the Council were to build 20,000 new homes, would 20,000 people occupy them? Conversely if the Council were to build 0 homes would 0 people require them? The group was informed that the household projection figures produced by the Welsh Government are the starting point in determining the appropriate level of growth for Cardiff. The logic for Option B uses these figures as a starting point and adjusts them based on a number of different factors arising out of the evidence base for the Plan.
- The group heard from Dr Stevie Upton (Research Officer, Institute of Welsh Affairs) that the market is unavoidable and it is this that will decide if houses are to be built in Cardiff. Members were advised that demand has a huge say in the acceptability of sites. If there are two available sites, the developer will always opt for the better or more attractive site.
- Members observed that property prices in the Valleys are considerably cheaper, however there are costs associated with living in the Valleys and commuting to Cardiff daily, such as transportation and congestion. However, restricting growth in Cardiff could squeeze the market and lead to increased property prices. The group was advised that a *range* and *choice* of property would help contribute to cheaper property prices unlike the trend of apartment building at the turn of the previous decade.

- Members enquired about suppressed housing figures (ie young adults living with their parents). and how far they are expressed in the household projection figures. The group was advised that suppressed demand was difficult to calculate, as mortgages are difficult to secure in the financial market. Members heard that the LDP must ensure there is sufficient scope to cater for the suppressed demand.
- The task group was told that during the period of the Plan, although the proposed build rate of 2,600 houses per annum during economic uncertainty is higher than the build rate of 1,800 at the peak of the economic boom, the projections are not unsound. The justification for these figures is the availability of greenfield sites, which would ensure the figures were deliverable.
- Members highlighted that inward migration mostly entailed young people and therefore questioned whether the proposed housing balance was correct. The group was made aware that ensuring a range and choice of housing stock is available should hypothetically result in people moving from areas such as Cathays to greenfield sites, thereby freeing up a house in Cardiff's 'student quarter'.

#### ***Addressing previous concerns***

- The Inspector has commented that the previous LDP made provision for the development of brownfield land, and this alone was not enough to fulfil the housing requirement, and deliver a range and choice of housing. The Joint Housing Land Availability Study requires the city to have a five year supply of land for housing, and at present there is only 2.3 years supply.
- The task group inquired whether WG felt there were any issues with the current draft Plan and were told there were no issues with the headline proposals.

- Members questioned how the current LDP would address the issues raised in the Examination Report (January 2010) following the previously submitted LDP. The task & finish group was told that the Plan would be based on robust evidence base. An important part of this was the consultancy work undertaken by Edge Analytics with regard to the household projection figures produced by WG.
- Members enquired what were Welsh Government's thoughts on the level of growth Cardiff' has opted for in developing its preferred strategy for the LDP. The task group was advised that there have been a number of meetings with Ministers who are generally satisfied with the level identified. In addition Members heard that surrounding local authorities' had mostly supported Option B level of growth.
- The task group heard that WG officials considered that in broad terms the LDP Preferred Strategy looks like a plan, which should get through to an examination and hopefully adoption. Ultimately it will be for an independent Inspector to determine this matter.

## STRATEGY

### *Strategic Sites*

- Welsh Government feel there is a range and choice of sites in this Plan, unlike the previous Plan, which solely relied on brownfield development. Finally the group was informed that there were no broad concerns with the LDP and that it is based within the realms of reality, thereby having a good chance of being adopted. However, this ultimately is within the remit of the independent Inspector.
- The task group heard that there is a need for a housing land supply and that brownfield development alone is not enough. The group was informed

that the Council should have an open dialogue with WG about the Haywood Report.

- Members explored the candidate site process, and how the Council invited submissions from developers and landowners. The sites were assessed against five factors including
  - environmental,
  - flood risk,
  - transportation,
  - neighbourhood, community and place making, and
  - infrastructure and deliverability.
  
- Members enquired whether developers would submit planning applications for candidate sites which do not meet the criteria set in the Preferred Strategy and what criteria would be used for rejecting certain candidate sites. The group was made aware that this was always a risk and was advised that the five factors referred to in the paragraph above were taken into account when assessing candidate sites.
  
- It was felt within the group that the Strategic Sites have not been sold because of a lack of lending in the current financial climate.
  
- The task group noted that the Preferred Strategy identifies three new communities for the city, around the areas of Creigiau, Pentrebane and Pontprennau. Members were keen to hear how, once the decision is taken to develop a Preferred Site, communities would be created. The group was made aware that extensive master planning would take place to create sustainable communities and that community engagement exercises will help to inform decision making of issues in existing areas.
  
- Members questioned the impact on existing communities. The group was made aware that there will be provision for open space and that new

development can help existing communities (for example, the provision of new district or local centres and increased public transport provision).

- The task group explored what sort of procedure is in place to ensure a balance of social and private housing, and was reassured that there will be phased delivery within each site and triggers in place to ensure that the type of development matches population growth.
- The Operational Manager Planning Policy submitted written evidence to the group that the flood risk can be effectively mitigated for a strategic employment site on land south of St Mellons Business Park. Costs associated with this work are not considered to undermine the financial viability of the proposal. Social and economic benefits of delivering a strategic employment site in St Mellons would be profound. In a Cardiff context, it would represent a key strategic site by providing a well accessed and high quality site which adds an extra dimension to the Cardiff offer in terms of office supply. Furthermore, its location adjacent to the main line offers the potential to develop direct rail links. Taking all evidence and assessments into account, it is considered that the economic and social benefits of this site are considered to outweigh environmental disbenefits and in this respect it is noted that mitigation measures can be delivered to reduce harm.
- The group was made aware that the officer team is not currently in dialogue with developers, as they are busy getting the document ready for 25 October's Council meeting. Subject to Council approval on 25 October 2012, dialogue with developers will commence. This will reveal whether landowners such as Plymouth Estates (owners of land west of Fairwater) are looking to sell individual parts of their land.

### ***Strategic Plans & Strategies***

- The task group heard that the Council recognises that the LDP Preferred Strategy must be consistent with “What Matters” (the Council’s Community Strategy) and the Wales Spatial Plan.
- Dr Upton explained to the group that the Wales Spatial Plan recognises Cardiff as the driver of the city region and also that the Plan notes that too much coastal development will stifle the Valley authorities.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### ***Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)***

- The task & finish group was made aware that the Council will be preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in parallel with preparation of the LDP and that an Infrastructure Plan will be published in tandem with consultation on the Deposit Plan in October 2013. In this respect transportation infrastructure is seen as critical to the sequence of land release.
- The group was informed that CIL might, or might not assist in providing infrastructure (dependent on financial viability) and that the housing provision identified in the latest version of the Plan appears sensible. However, other representors such as the Home Builders Federation will potentially seek a higher level of provision. The group was made aware that it is important to evidence the phasing of development, linkages to infrastructure and finance, to provide a balanced solution through a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites.
- Members observed that cheaper property prices in the Valleys were due to poor transport links, and enquired whether there is dialogue between authorities. The group was made aware that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL - a charge that can be placed on new developments) can help



deliver infrastructure outside of the county boundary and there is recognition from Cardiff Council of the need for cross-boundary transportation infrastructure. The group was advised that outside of Cardiff there is little initiative to negate traffic, whilst Cardiff Council does recognise the need to create hubs and park and ride schemes.

- The task group enquired how developers would be incentivised to build. The group was advised that developers normally require an 18% profitability margin but CIL will create a pot of money to fund key infrastructure projects such as schools and roads.
- Members stressed the importance of sustainable and appropriate schools provision in delivering new communities, and heard that it was a major consideration and planning officers were currently liaising with the Schools section of the Council.
- The task group examined whether demand on brownfield development would be affected if greenfield development were released. Brownfield is popular because it sits within existing communities. Members were advised that the CIL could ensure a different levy is placed on brownfield to greenfield development to ensure brownfield remains attractive.
- Members explored closely the control the Council has over infrastructure. The group was made aware that the M4 is a critical asset to the City's infrastructure. Members were informed that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would negate infrastructure worries.
- Members highlighted that the strategic sites would potentially place a burden on Cardiff's existing infrastructure resulting in choke points into the City. The group was made aware that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could work on infrastructure outside the county's boundary.

- The group sought rough costings of CIL. The group was made aware that commissioning experts will work on CIL but there are a number of key variables within CIL such as social housing and retail, which means comparisons with other local authorities, cannot be made. Phasing, the group was told, is critical and the Sustainability Appraisal is identifying which transport projects need to come about first. The group was also reminded that at the present time, the Council is vulnerable to planning applications on strategic sites.
- A question was raised regarding Section 106 agreements and what powers the council has without an LDP. The group was made aware that the Council can still negotiate Section 106 agreements and Planning Obligations but if there is no masterplan in place, the Council cannot look at the wider area and CIL.
- The task group heard from Welsh Government that there is an assumption that housing and transport strategy should be appropriately phased. The Community Infrastructure Levy could provide financial support for infrastructure and there will also be inter-dependencies within the Plan that will require resolving. The group was informed that finance should align with development; however Members suggested that the LDP process lacks clarity regarding funding to support the provision of infrastructure in the Plan.
- Officers clarified that the inspector for the CIL was different to the inspector for the LDP, however they do run concurrently.

#### ***Transport - General***

- Members heard of the importance of transport to the LDP. They enquired whether transport comes prior to development, or at the same time. They were advised of the need to provide alternative modes of transport *before* housing units are provided; that community facilities need to be within

walking distance to negate the use of cars; and that there is a need for a modal shift and a regional approach to transportation.

- The task group heard that SEWTA (South East Wales Transport Alliance) are key to the transport infrastructure plan and are looking at a timeframe of 2030 and beyond. Transport projects outside of Cardiff's boundary need to be taken seriously.
- The group was also made aware that £9 million is available annually for funding transport schemes, and this is very small sum. They enquired about the affordability of the Eastern Bay Link road.
- Members felt the infrastructure plan should minimise car use and recognise the potentially negative effect of congestion charging on those with lower incomes. The group was made aware that the Plan cannot afford to be anti-car but there is an aspiration to increase public transport levels. 30% of Cardiff's residents do not have access to a car, but the identified strategic sites will require the building of highways.
- Members noted that compared with the previous Preferred Strategy two major infrastructure projects have been withdrawn. They explored whether the LDP could be refused on transport issues and heard that in the coming months Cardiff Council officers would have to resolve such questions. With increased housing in the city there is the potential for fewer daily commuters.

#### ***Transport - Regional approach***

- The group was made aware that the current WG Minister is in favour of a regional transport body and it was pleasing that transport was included in the Council's Preferred Strategy.
- Cardiff is the hub for the public transport network for South East Wales. The importance of transport and moving people around the region is

central to the LDP infrastructure plan. Members heard from Mark Barry, consultant to the Institute of Welsh Affairs, that Cardiff currently underperforms for the region compared with other large cities that are core to their city regions.

- The group was informed that whilst Greater Manchester was investing in public transport, South East Wales is undercapitalised, has an ageing infrastructure, and that the Cardiff city region transport infrastructure is hindering investment.
- A third of all people employed in South East Wales work in Cardiff. 80% of these use cars, and the remainder use public transport.
- Members heard that the city-region concept was the preferred option. With electrification, it was felt, the south part of the Valleys were easily accessible and that trams were likely to afford modal shift.
- The task group was advised of the need for a link to the east of Cardiff and that an analogy could be drawn between Sheffield and Cardiff as the two cities are geographically similar.
- Members observed that Cardiff has successfully managed the transportation of large numbers into the City from the region for events in the city centre; perhaps contrary to the daily struggle it faces with the level of daily commuters.

### ***Transport - Road***

- The group was made aware that currently Junction 30 of the M4 at Cardiff Gate is operating at capacity during peak times. Signalisation of the roundabout system over the previous two to three years has helped to accommodate traffic. However, there is a need to encourage people to use alternative modes of transport. The group was further made aware that there is scope for introducing bus accessibility in northeast Cardiff.

- Members heard that without investment road networks around the City would potentially become choked, but the news of electrification of the railways was a big plus. The group was made aware that there are a number of transport options than can be pursued but nothing is definite at this stage. Officers advised that the level of work required does not form a part of the Preferred Strategy stage of the LDP.
- Members explored the cost of building a link road to Llantrisant Road and were advised that there should be an alternative mode of transport, citing bus rapid transport as an option. The group was also made aware that a completely new road link could be built to the east of Fairwater into Waterhall. Funding from CIL and the Welsh Government could help to deliver the project. Members expressed a view that there is no value in a segregated bus corridor for Waterhall as traffic will be encountered once the segregated lane comes to an end. The group was advised that there is provision to protect the corridor of land that exists for a train line, but this was outside the Plan period. The group was also made aware that the Council would find ways and means of negating pinch points (for example, bus to rail transfers).

### ***Transport - Rail***

- Members enquired whether it is feasible to link the Coryton railway line with Radyr railway station thereby creating a circular line. Officers indicated that a circular line will be investigated, as currently most journeys across the city are made in private cars because there is no cross-city bus / rail provision. WG and Network Rail are aware of this possibility but it would prove expensive because of the need to build a bridge. The group was advised that, had electrification not have happened, the loop would have been more likely. However Members heard from Professor Stuart Cole, Professor of Transport, University of Glamorgan that there is no identified funding for the link within the Plan period.

- Members stressed the need to plan a transport network that can accommodate the changing population. They noted that many cities have longer railway platforms; heard that work is currently underway to increase capacity at Cardiff Queen Street and Cardiff Central railway stations; and that patronage on trains has risen over the past 10 years; however bus patronage is largely static.
- Cardiff's entire rail network will be electrified by 2018. The operational benefits to the service will be faster stock, cleaner and more efficient trains and reduced maintenance.
- The task group heard that there is an opportunity for a branded integrated transport system in Cardiff similar to that of the Oyster Card in London. This would potentially increase patronage. The group was informed that train and bus stations need to be built next to each other to ensure maximum connectivity.
- The task group was introduced to *tram-trains* by Mark Barry and advised that a trial is currently being piloted in Sheffield. The group was made aware that tram-trains allow for small spurs from the existing heavy rail line, allowing for shorter journeys and easier access.
- The group was informed that the city of Leeds has *trolley-buses*, which are a low-cost alternative. The group was also informed that *modal shift* is achieved when introducing a new form of public transport.
- The group heard that developer contributions could help to achieve the tram-train vision from strategic site developments such as Waterhall in the west of Cardiff.
- Members were informed that Cardiff Council had undertaken a survey six to seven years previously, which provided an evidence base for light-rail

spurs. It was suggested Members may wish to look at qualitative evidence in the form of what other cities have done.

- The group was made aware that there is a need for a coherent network where different companies could operate the different sectors of the network. Further to this, the group was advised that under the current train transport system any extra carriages added to the train have to be paid for. Therefore there is a disincentive to do this because the train company loses money.
- Members enquired about the high cost of the proposed South Wales Metro system, and what commitment is currently in place regarding this. The group was made aware that in Europe they have a legacy of electrification and that the cost is significantly cheaper than heavy rail. The group was made aware that tram-trains cost approximately £10 to £20 million per mile to implement. The group was also made aware that the local authorities that make up Greater Manchester collaborated to form a pool of money to take to UK government in order to fund Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive.
- The group sought clarity on the benefits electrification would bring. It was explained that, with electrification, there is the potential for four carriage trains therefore increasing passenger capacity, and platform extensions should be completed by 2015. The group was also made aware that re-signalling has begun and will continue for the next two years or so. The group was also informed that an additional platform (Platform 8) will be built at Cardiff Central and the currently vacant platform at Queen Street station will be opened, with the bay train departing from the end of Platform 3. The benefits for Cardiff residents are potentially less than for residents in the Valleys. Train use has doubled every seven years in the Valleys; with electrification, passengers from the Valleys will be able to travel into Cardiff more quickly.

- Members heard that in both Liverpool and Newcastle the train franchise is specified by the local authority and asked why the same cannot be done in Cardiff.
- It was felt by the group that a tram-train system will take a lot of funding and political drive and that it is unlikely to happen within the next 10-15 years. The group was made aware that rapid bus transport is a realistic alternative, but it will take strong political leadership for a tram-train system to be implemented.
- The task group identified the need to resolve current difficulties with east - west and west - east journeys across the city. The group was made aware that there is a need to consider all available options. Trolley or guided buses are a viable option for the next six to seven years. Beyond that there is the option of exploring tram-trains.
- The tram system in Manchester is very efficient, running until 1:30am every day.
- Members were informed that rail travel is operated exclusively by Network Rail. Electrification will provide a major impact that will encourage people out of their cars. Electrification will be across the South Wales network, but not include Abergavenny, Chepstow etc.
- There is a re-operable rail track-bed in the west of Cardiff extending to Creigiau.
- Critical to the Infrastructure Plan will be the integration of park and ride with rail and bus stations. Professor Cole cited the example of the park and ride at Pentwyn, which is not successful because car users driving on the A48 into Cardiff are unlikely to leave a main road.



- With regard to the governance of rail systems, the group heard that Welsh Government would need to engage with new schemes, more so than the train companies. It was explained to the group that in 2018 there will be a new franchise along with the electric trains. WG have commenced public transport consultation and now is an appropriate time for the Council's LDP Preferred Strategy to feed into the WG thought process.
- Members explored the possibility of the current franchise accepting the re-opening of the Creigiau line. Mark Barry advised that it was about a coordination of budgets between WG, Network Rail and the local authority. The group was also made aware that the re-opening of the Creigiau line would be expensive, but that the land is available. Whilst it is highly unlikely to happen in the next five years, the UK government has a longer term plan for the development of the railway system. Professor Cole felt it was highly unlikely between 2019 and 2024, but more likely between 2024 and 2029.
- Members enquired about the merits of light rail (FTR). The group was advised it is preferable to implement tram-trains. Whilst FTR has been successful in Swansea, it has not succeeded in other pilot cities. However FTR is an attractive pre-cursor to trams.
- The Operational Manager Transport Strategy & Projects advised that Network Rail's plans for electrification fit with Cardiff's Local Development Plan, and there will now be work on an exact transport plan, along with CIL.
- Critically, Members heard that political thinking is regionally minded and it is imperative to protect key transport routes, such as the disbanded Creigiau line. The group was made aware that master planning would show that level of detail. However, the group's attention was drawn to planning blight, as there are a number of issues with the Creigiau line, such as back gardens crossing it and a lake.

### ***Transport - Bus***

- The task group were supportive of the need for bus lanes. They heard from the Professor of Transport, University of Glamorgan that, due to legislation passed in 1985 when the market was the driver, bus provision is a problem as bus companies look for profit and not patronage. This is notably different to London, where companies bid for routes.
- The group heard Professor Cole suggest that a favourable option for Cardiff Central bus station is to demolish Marland House and build a bus station whilst the current one is still operational.
- Members heard that the infrastructure for bus routes is already in place, but that is not the case for trains.
- It was suggested that there are opportunities for Park and Ride in Lisvane. Members argued that there is not significant infrastructure currently in Lisvane to support a new community travelling to Lisvane / Thornhill train station daily. The group was advised it was unlikely that a large number of people will start walking or cycling, but that a new bus priority lane out of Lisvane will help negate some congestion. There was evidence to suggest that from a psychological point of view the lack of interaction between driver and passenger on a train, compared with a bus, is thought to drive up patronage.
- The task group felt that, if the development of land between Lisvane and Pontprennau was to be successful, a bus lane needs to be in place before the development is built, so residents do not become reliant on their cars.
- Members highlighted that people already have their cars which are paid for, so where was the incentive to use public transport? For public transport to be viable, it was felt that it had to be a lot faster form of travel than the private car. The group was advised that whilst this assumption

was correct in terms of cost, there are wider costs which include congestion, environmental and petrol.

- Professor Cole suggested the introduction of bendy buses has helped to change the perception of buses. Whilst bus prices are not particularly high; the ticketing process needs to be looked at. An example was given of the over 60s bus pass and how it can also be used on trains.
- The group heard that there is a need to explore a Park and Ride option at the proposed Waterhall strategic site.

## ECONOMIC

- Members heard that historically Wales' share of inward investment was 20% of the UK's figures. However, currently it is at 2%. The Operational Manager Economy & Major Projects felt this provided optimism that the market will return and create more projects and jobs. However, current economic activity projections would be very adversely affected if the Euro crashed.
- The group was advised that the Cardiff city region is operating at 80% of average UK GDP. Key to attracting investment is first impressions – arrival in the City, the travel to work experience and accessibility to expertise.
- Members heard that economically Cardiff has six key market sectors, namely Automotive and Manufacturing, Financial and Business Services, ICT, Creative Industry, Life Sciences and Tourism, which are important drivers and creators of jobs. Members were advised that it is important to understand the drivers behind these sectors and from where demand stems. Currently the financial and business sectors are still buoyant. The ICT sector is also growing. The same can be said for the creative sector, but it is also generating new businesses locally, particularly start-ups. The

growth in jobs in the business sector should increase, but UK economy is predicted to be in recession until 2016/2017 and there will still be job losses and company closures to deal with.

- Welsh Government strategy has been to promote Cardiff within the context of Wales, and it is expected this will change. The group was advised that promotion of Cardiff should be focused on London, as it is a major source of investment in the UK and globally. Welsh Government now has a London office.

### ***City Region***

- Cardiff is in a unique regional position. Members noted that RCT, Merthyr Tydfil and Caerphilly have adopted plans in place. A test of 'soundness' relates to cross boundary traffic/infrastructure. The Planning Inspector will raise issues identified by other representors. A joint LDP can voluntarily be undertaken but to date cross-boundary working has not been as extensive as anticipated. The group was informed that WG has the power to facilitate a more regional approach but would prefer not to intervene, allowing local authorities to prepare their own LDPs.
- Members heard that Cardiff has 2 options; grow the city alone or pursue a city region approach.
- The city region is defined as the travel to work area; where most people spend most of their lives. To be competitive, there is a need for a critical mass. In this instance, it is the Cardiff city region. Dr Upton suggested Cardiff cannot go it alone; it needs the Valley authorities. Cardiff also needs to make the first move with regards to the city region dimension, and that it is a very short-term vision to think Cardiff can go it alone.
- Members enquired what the key drivers for regional change were. They heard transport does not recognise local authority boundaries. Examples

of successful city regions, from which Cardiff can learn good practice, were cited, such as Vancouver and Stuttgart as well as Greater Manchester, which is very successful as a city region. In Stuttgart, 60% of the population live within 600 metres of a light rail station. The closer the population is to the city's core, the more sustainable the city will be.

- Members explored the city region concept, and there was a suggestion that populating Cardiff with houses would hold no benefit for the Valleys. The group was advised that Rhondda Cynon Taff is growing, with 490 house completions per annum. There is a view that constraining development in Cardiff would aid growth in the valleys, but officers felt this was not the case. Cardiff is the location developers find attractive, however officers commented that South East Wales as a whole is bottom of the table for regional competitiveness. The group heard that Cardiff has to think regionally when constructing its own economic plan.
- The task group heard from the Operational Manager Planning Policy there will not be development to the north of the M4. Officers were of the opinion that whilst the focus at present appears to be the city-region debate, the real focus in the short term must be on progressing Cardiff's LDP. Cardiff could not allocate land in neighbouring authorities to meet its housing needs, and if there were to be pre-application discussions with neighbouring authorities regarding Strategic Sites this would prejudice the Plan.
- With regards to the city-region dimension, Members enquired how much credence could be given to a matter, which may or may not happen before the end of the Plan period. The group was made aware that the Council had engaged in regional collaborative working over the winter with the Countryside Council for Wales (CCW), Welsh Government (WG), South East Wales Strategic Planning Group (SEWSPG), South East Wales Transport Alliance (SEWTA) and the Environment Agency (EA). The first Councils with adopted LDPs in South East Wales worked in isolation,

whilst Cardiff Council is having an open dialogue with neighbouring authorities.

- Members are elected to Cardiff Council rather than a larger regional body, and the present system does not allow for true collaborative plans as the system is bounded by the current local authority boundaries. The group was informed that as part of the '10 tests of soundness' there is a stipulation of working across statutory boundaries that have to be evidenced.
- Where large developments such as the LG site are planned the group felt it was a better suggestion that they are regionally allocated. The group was also made aware that there are clear demands in terms of land release, and there is a need to think regionally wherever possible.
- Members heard that there is a risk for Cardiff to be perceived as exporting problems to neighbouring local authorities. The problem must be viewed as to how it will affect the region rather than how it will affect Cardiff. It is not about shifting the problem, but about selling yourself as a region or city.
- A recent Roger Tym & Partners publication illustrated that neighbouring local authorities were not meeting their housing targets. The group was made aware that this is unlikely to change if Cardiff gets greenfield development, as the market will choose Cardiff over the Valley authorities.
- The task group enquired about the role Welsh Government has to play in the regional working debate. The group was informed that WG will not stand in the way of regional working and that the Haywood Report has stated the need for cross-boundary working when building new homes. However regional plans such as those adopted in Scotland were felt to be a long way off.

- Members noted that joint LDPs would not work because Cardiff is too far behind other local authorities in producing its LDP. The group was advised that most of Cardiff's neighbouring authorities were opting for high levels of housing growth and that, whilst some figures might be aspirational, they are planning positively to address the relevant issues. Local authorities have to submit evidence to support the housing provision they wish to provide if they differ to the WG's latest projections. The task group heard there is a limit to how far the market will venture into the Valleys. Finally the group was informed that the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) could provide an opportunity to open up a dialogue between Cardiff and neighbouring local authorities.
- The task group explored the city region approach and whether this could be planned for in the LDP. The group was made aware that the authority has a statutory duty to prepare a LDP and there are many questions with regard to the regional approach such as boundary lines, voting process, and whether there is equal status across the local authorities which make up the region, that have yet to be resolved.

### ***Office space***

- Members enquired as to the major factors that will lead to Cardiff's economic growth. Officers advised significant growth will come through the enterprise zone based around Cardiff Central rail and bus stations and the provision for up to 1 million square foot of office space. The group was advised that competition for investment is significant. Currently there is good office stock available in cities outside of Cardiff, and therefore investors are encouraged to go elsewhere. Grade A office space needs to be made available as a priority to attract investment.
- Additionally Members heard that Cardiff has to ensure it has a ready stock of industrial warehousing that businesses can straightforwardly move into. In the past the business sector has been reluctant to invest in Cardiff

because of a lack of available, good quality office stock. Returns to investors in the current financial climate have also restricted new development.

- The task group explored whether the Option B proposed figures for the creation of jobs and their achievability was too low at 40,000. The group was informed that it was very difficult to be precise in view of the current economic situation; however there is a potential commitment from Welsh Government's announcement on office space referred to above that would create 10,000-15,000 new jobs. Inward investment figures should improve over the next 10 years as promotion of Cardiff and the provision of good quality office accommodation and skills are developed.

### ***Tourism***

- Members inquired whether the LDP takes tourism into account. The group was informed that tourism is a priority sector for the Council and that tourism numbers were rising considerably which has been re-affirmed by independent analysis. The International Sports Village is a major tourism product. The group was informed that electrification of the London rail line and a new direct rail link to Heathrow would increase tourism in the future.

## **SOCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL**

### ***Social Housing & Communities***

- The task group observed that young people are "drifting" to the Valleys to purchase affordable homes. They felt that the Council must be mindful of building [isolated] social housing on greenfield land. However, the group was reminded that the Council would be less likely to secure social housing on brownfield land due to developers needing to recover costs.
- Members heard that the Council has a proactive approach to affordable housing issues, and is currently meeting the 40% target. They were



informed of a scheme building homes for first time buyers, which locks the buyer into a contract to ensure they do not sell on for profit. For example a current application for planning permission at Ely Bridge is a model held as an example to repeat across Wales.

- Members noted that social housing waiting lists are increasing year on year and there is a need to implement the Plan sooner rather than later.
- The task group stressed that social housing should be high in quality. Officers suggested that often affordable housing is of a better build quality than private housing and the importance of the houses being a good size with adequate bedroom space. Members highlighted the dangers of having all social housing in one area / community, that a good mixture was desirable.
- Officers advised that housing associations take on the provision of affordable homes, and these have to meet BREEAM standards and code level 3 for sustainable homes as a minimum.
- Members stressed the need for the additional strategic sites identified in the LDP to focus on improving community facilities. Officers advised that the Council is assertive on negotiating community benefits where development is proposed, and it is rare that the Council would agree to a developer making a contribution off site.
- The task group were keen to ensure that external agencies, such as the Cardiff and Vale University Health Board, had an opportunity to input into the Plan, particularly on the issue of community services. They were advised that wherever possible the Council works corporately with the health service to ensure a co-ordinated approach.

- Anti-social behaviour can be designed out of neighbourhoods. As part of the master planning process, officers would liaise with police architecture liaison officers who can help to negate these issues.
- Walkways or 'links' between housing estates and communities have in the past exacerbated anti-social behaviour. The group was advised that research was underway to identify best practice examples of successful neighbourhoods in other countries.
- Gypsy / traveller issues were explored, and the group was informed that the Council was currently in the process of commissioning a study to look both at the need for accommodation and potential sites to meet this need. The group was also made aware that the future of Rover Way is uncertain and a separate study to look at options for this site was also under investigation.
- Finally Members raised the matter of the elderly and student populations. The group was informed that as much as possible was being done to ensure people can live independently in their own homes for as long as possible.

### ***Environmental***

- Members once again heard that the Council is under pressure to produce an LDP to avoid situations such as the recently lost appeal in Michaelston Road. They were informed that there is potentially a risk of unsustainable building if land is not released for development. However, releasing land does not necessarily mean development will be sustainable.
- The group was advised that the city has a number of critical natural assets, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), flood risk areas, and Garth Mountain, and these are assets to be protected in the future.

- Members enquired about the Welsh Government target for tree planting and in particular how Cardiff would meet its needs. The task group was advised that the Landscape Assessment would inform the decision on which areas within the city are appropriate.
- The group was made aware that national policy stated greenfield land per head of population guidelines were 6 hectares per 1000 people. It was noted that large areas of green space would remain after the development of the sites proposed in the LDP Preferred Strategy.
- Officers confirmed that protection of biodiversity and river valleys was part of the master planning process. The group was advised that networks are built so wildlife can move freely with minimal disruption. There will be a requirement to build networks of paths and open space. Woodland areas within the chosen sites would be protected.
- Members were made aware that a right of way can be diverted but the policy will be to retain them wherever possible, as they are assets to the communities they serve.
- The group was informed that areas of special interest would be a key part of the design process. The master planning process would have areas of green space that are allowed to develop naturally. Included in this would be footpaths and cycle paths.
- Members were to ensure the plan addresses flooding, and in particular, surface water flooding. They were again advised that this level of detail would come down to the master planning process. The group was informed that in England, planning permission is required to pave driveways, as unpaved they assist in negating surface water flooding.

## PROCESS FOR SCRUTINY OF THE PREFERRED STRATEGY

The Policy Review and Performance Scrutiny Committee considered arrangements for the Scrutiny of the Draft Preferred Strategy on 4 July 2012 and agreed:

- I. To establish a task and finish group to consider the draft Preferred Strategy of the Local Development Plan, comprising of the Chairpersons of the Council's five scrutiny committees, plus 2 volunteers from each committee.
- II. That the report will be published by the Policy Review and Performance Scrutiny Committee.

A task and finish group was established consisting of the five scrutiny committee Chairs, and ten additional volunteers drawn from the five scrutiny Committees, and broadly politically representative of the Council's overall political composition. The task and finish group set out to test whether the Preferred Strategy was fit for purpose, to examine the policies it contained, and to satisfy itself that the plan can:

- Deliver sustainable development
- Reflect local aspirations for the city, based on a vision agreed by the local community and other stakeholders
- Provide a basis for rational and consistent development control decisions
- Guide growth and change, while protecting local diversity, character and sensitive environments
- Show how and where change will occur over the plan period

The scrutiny of the Preferred Strategy took place over four meetings and received evidence from the following witnesses:

### **Internal Witnesses**

- Cabinet Member Councillor Ralph Cook
- James Clemence Operational Manager, Planning Policy
- Phil Williams, Operational Manager, Strategic Planning & Development Management
- Paul Carter, Operational Manager, Transport Strategy & Projects
- Ken Poole, Operational Manager, Economy & Major Projects
- Stuart Williams, Group Leader, Strategic Policy
- Jason Dixon Team Leader, Transport Policy
- Mike Friel Operational Manager, Housing Strategy Advice & Support
- Michelle Brewer Housing Strategy & Supporting People Manager

### **External Witnesses**

- Mark Newey (Head of Local Development, Welsh Government)
- Mark Barry (M&G Barry Consulting)
- Dr Stevie Upton (Research Officer, Institute of Welsh Affairs)
- Professor Stuart Cole (Professor of Transport, University of Glamorgan)

Details of all evidence considered by the task group and used in the preparation of this report are contained within a record of evidence that is available for inspection upon request to the Operational Manager Scrutiny.

## REFERENCES / BACKGROUND PAPERS

A Metro for Wales' Capital City Region, Mark Barry, 2011

Cardiff Local Development Plan. Population and household projections phase 2 report. Edge Analytics, June 2011

Cardiff What Matters – The 10 Year Strategy 2010:2020

City Regions Final Report, Welsh Government, Dr Haywood, July 2012

Forging a new connection between Cardiff and the Valleys, Dr Stevie Upton, 2012

Local Development Plan 2006-2026

Local Development Plan Examination (Inspector's report)

Local Development Plan Preferred Strategy 2011-2026

Planning Policy Wales (Edition 4, February 2011)

SEWTA Business Plan 2012-2013

Strategic Planning for the Cardiff City Region, Roger Tym & Partners, 2011

Wales Spatial Plan, 2004

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not to make policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct legal implications. However, legal implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without modification. Any report with recommendations for decision that goes to Executive / Council will set out any legal implications arising from those recommendations. All decisions taken by or on behalf of the Council must (a) be within the legal power of the Council; (b) comply with any procedural requirement imposed by law; (c) be within the powers of the body or person exercising powers on behalf of the Council; (d) be undertaken in accordance with the procedural requirements imposed by the Council e.g. standing orders and financial regulations; (e) be fully and properly informed; (f) be properly motivated; (g) be taken having regard to the Council's fiduciary duty to its taxpayers; and (h) be reasonable and proper in all the circumstances.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not to make policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct financial implications at this stage in relation to any of the work programme. However, financial implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without any modifications.

**POLICY REVIEW & PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**



Councillor Elizabeth Clark

(Chairperson)



Councillor Phil Bale



Councillor Garry Hunt



Councillor Keith Jones



Councillor Sam Knight



Councillor Kathryn Lloyd



Councillor Paul Mitchell



Councillor Adrian Robson



Councillor David Walker



## **POLICY REVIEW & PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

To scrutinise, monitor and review the overall operation of the Cardiff Programme for Improvement and the effectiveness of the general implementation of the Council's policies, aims and objectives, including:

To scrutinise, monitor and review the effectiveness of the Council's systems of financial control and administration and use of human resources.

To report to an appropriate Cabinet or Council meeting on its findings and to make recommendations on measures, which may enhance Council performance in this area.

**DRAFT**

