Pecyn dogfennau cyhoeddus

Y Pwyllgor Amgylchedd a Chynaliadwyedd

Lleoliad:
Ystafell Bwyllgora 3 - Senedd

Dyddiad:
Dydd Mercher, 19 Mawrth 2014

Amser:
09.00

Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru
National Assembly for Wales

I gael rhagor o wybodaeth, cysylltwch â:
Alun Davidson
Clerc y Pwyllgor
029 2089 8639
Pwyllgorac@cymru.gov.uk

Agenda

Sesiwn breifat

1 Rheoli Tir Cynaliadwy - Trafod y prif faterion (09:00 - 09:30)

Sesiwn gyhoeddus

2 Cyflwyniad, ymddiheuriadau a dirprwyon

3 Y Bil Cynllunio (Cymru) Drafft: Cymdeithas Llywodraeth Leol Cymru a Chymdeithas Swyddogion Cynllunio Cymru (09:30 - 10:30) (Tudalennau 1 - 14)

E&S(4)-09-14 papur 1 - Cymdeithas Llywodraeth Leol Cymru

Jane Lee, Swyddog Polisi - Ewrop ac Adfywio, Cymdeithas Llywodraeth Leol Cymru
Eifion Bowen, Pennaeth Cynllunio, Cyngor Sir Caerfyrddin

Cymdeithas Swyddogion Cynllunio Cymru

Andrew Farrow, Cadeirydd a Phennaeth Cynllunio, Cyngor Sir y Fflint
Vicky Hirst, Is-gadeirydd a Phennaeth Rheoli Datblygu, Parc Cenedlaethol Arfordir Penfro

4 Y Bil Cynllunio (Cymru) Drafft: Cymorth Cynllunio Lloegr (10:30 - 11:15)

John Romanski, Pennaeth Cymorth Cynllunio Lloegr

5 Y Bil Cynllunio (Cymru) Drafft: Un Llais Cymru | Cymorth Cynllunio Cymru (11:15 - 12:00)

Lyn Cadwallader, Prif Weithredwr, Un Llais Cymru
Cynghorydd Mike Cuddy, Arweinydd, Cyngor Tref Penarth
Elwyn Thomas, Prif Weithredwr, Cymorth Cynllunio Cymru

6 Y Bil Cynllunio (Cymru) Drafft: Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg (12:00 - 12:30)

Robin Farrar, Cadeirydd
Colin Nosworthy, Swyddog Cyfathrebu a Chyswllt y Cynulliad

7 Papurau i'w nodi (Tudalennau 15 - 20)

Cofnodion y cyfarfodydd a gynhaliwyd ar 12 a 20 Chwefror ac ar 5 Mawrth

Mae cyfyngiadau ar y ddogfen hon

Mae cyfyngiadau ar y ddogfen hon

Mae cyfyngiadau ar y ddogfen hon

Positive Planning

February 2014

WLGA • CLlLC

INTRODUCTION

1. The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) represents the 22 local authorities in Wales, and the three national park authorities and the three fire and rescue authorities.

2. It seeks to provide representation to local authorities within an emerging policy framework that satisfies the key priorities of our members and delivers a broad range of services that add value to Welsh Local Government and the communities they serve.

3. The WLGA welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposals to reform the planning system in Wales and is happy for comments to be published.

4. This consultation forms part of Welsh Government's legislative programme and comments offered are in the context of complementary legislation, declining budgets and the growing possibility of local government reorganisation.

5. Answers to the consultation questions are supplied below and these were endorsed at the WLGA Council meeting on 28th February. However, Members also stressed a number of key, overarching points that they asked to be added into the response.

   - A number of the proposals, if implemented, would seriously dilute the role of locally elected members in the planning system and could result in the re-formation of 'quangos'. Members bring democratic accountability to the planning process and their roles should be retained and respected, not squeezed out as part of a misguided attempt to make planning more strategic and streamlined

   - Whilst land use planning needs to operate at different spatial levels the relationships between plans need to be clear, their production must be properly synchronised and additional tiers of planning should not be introduced unless it can be clearly demonstrated how they will deliver improvement. The consultation document does not set out clearly what the benefits of proposed changes are expected to be.

   - Linked to both the above points, town and community councils cannot be expected to undertake a localised role as part of new planning arrangements when their capacity to deliver is variable across Wales (or in some cases non-existent due to their lack of 100% coverage).

Culture Change

Q1 Do you agree that the proposed remit for a Planning Advisory and Improvement Service will help local planning authorities and stakeholders to improve performance?

6. The proposal for a PAIS is welcomed, however the WLGA is disappointed that the decision has been taken for WG to host this service. The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) in England is funded by DCLG but hosted by the Local Government Association. Following the release of the Independent Advisory Group report in 2012 which recommended the setting up of a Planning & Advisory Board, the WLGA had informal discussions with WG to explore options including replicating the England arrangements in Wales. These discussions did not progress far and the proposal for WG to host the PAIS is contrary to the IAG which recommended an independent body, the views of LPA planners and consideration of what works in other parts of the UK. Colleagues in LPAs in England have commented that the 'independence' of PAS has resulted in a service that is trusted friend and well received as PAS is considered part of the local government family and working for local authorities not central government. The proposals within Positive Planning are significantly different from the PAS arrangement and therefore it is likely that the service will be viewed differently.

7. The WLGA welcomes the opportunity to comment further on the establishment of the service and the membership of the external steering group. The Positive Planning document does not provide a timescale for this additional consultation but the Minister has indicated that he would like the PAIS operational from April 2014 and is requesting representatives for the Steering Group. This begs the question what the additional consultation will focus on.

8. In light of the Williams Commission report and proposal for a new pan-public service leadership body to set values, competencies and meet all training needs, the proposal for a PAIS may need greater consideration rather than pushing ahead for an April 2014 implementation.

9. In line with arrangements with England, WLGA seeks clarification whether an ATLAS (Advisory Team for Large Applications) function would be part of PAIS to assist local authorities with the larger more complex applications?

10. The service offered to LPAs in England by PAS is free of charge. In times of declining budgets, it is imperative that the PAIS service is offered on a simliar basis. LPAs will not have the budgets to pay for the PAIS services.

11. The WLGA has, in recent months, been working closely with the Data Unit Wales and POSW on performance improvement and benchmarking. We look forward to further detail on how the proposed PAIS will link with existing organisations such as the Data Unit and POSW to prevent duplication of effort and message.

Q2 Do you agree that existing Welsh Government support arrangements for the built environment sector in Wales should be reviewed?

12. It is our understanding that this question relates to the Design Commission for Wales, Construction Excellence and CREW. There would be merit in drawing on the skills within these organisations to upskill planners and elected members and this could be achieved with the current structures. We would not support the closure of these organisations in order that their functions be absorbed into a PAIS within WG.

Q3 Do you agree that competency frameworks should be prepared for planning practitioners and elected representatives to describe the skills, knowledge and behaviours necessary to deliver planning reforms?

13. The consultation document is not specific on whether the competency framework is directed at LPAs only or across all planning practitioners, nor is it specific on its status as a mandatory or discretionary framework and how it would be implemented and enforced. If Welsh Government is committed to their vision that all stakeholders need to change then it would seem appropriate that many of the proposals such as this, should not be specifically aimed at local authorities alone.

14. The RTPI has a Competency Framework and therefore the WLGA would welcome clarification on how the competency framework for planning practitioners proposed in Positive Planning would differ and whether it is necessary to potentially duplicate.

15. In terms of the competency framework for elected members, clarification is sought on how this would be drafted, implemented and funded. The WLGA has developed competency frameworks for members and could assist with the development of this proposal. The specific competency framework developed for planning should align with the WLGA's overall competency framework for members. This joint approach also applies to training as the WLGA has a national training programme and links with Democratic Services officers in all the local authorities. In the past the WLGA commissioned member training on the planning function which was delivered across Wales and in 2012 commissioned the preparation of a Members Planning Handbook which can be downloaded from our website **http://www.wlga.gov.uk/publications-and-consultation-responses-imp/planning-handbook-a-guide-for-local-authority-members/**

Active Stewardship

Q4. Do you agree that the National Development Framework will provide a robust framework for setting national priorities and aid delivery?

16. The replacement of the WSP with a National Development Framework is supported. There are a number of national plans in existence or in the pipeline (WIIP, WEFO Economic Prioritisation Framework, National Transport Plan, Natural Resources Management Plan) and the NDF should complement these. Further clarification is sought on the hierarchy of plans. If the NDF has development plan status should this

influence the NTP, WIIP or does WG envisage the relationship between plans to be the reverse of this?

17. Positive Planning does not indicate the estimated timescales involved with producing the NDF and the subsequent timing of the production of SDPs. Further clarification on timescales would be welcomed. The proposal for the NDF is for it to be a national land use plan. Our interpretation of this is that it will have a spatial element and will put lines on maps. We do not agree therefore with the proposed 12 week consultation which we consider insufficient for the scrutiny of a plan which will have Development Plan status. This 'quick' consultation could result in the plan being open to challenge with a resulting loss of credibility and influence. One of the main criticisms of the Wales Spatial Plan is that it has not been subject to a public examination and therefore does not have appropriate weight and credibility to guide land use.

18. The consultation document implies that the NDF will be for a time period of 20 years mininum but there is no indication of a monitoring process similar to the annual monitoring arrangements imposed on LPAs by WG. WG commit to a 5 yearly review of the NDF but no annual monitoring arrangements and review.

Q5. Do you agree that Planning Policy Wales and Minerals Planning Policy Wales should be integrated to form a single document?

19. This proposal should be a low priority for WG. The WLGA can see the merits in integration but also in keeping the two separate as Minerals is a specialist area.

Q6. Do you agree that a core set of development management policies should be prepared for consistent application by all local planning authorities?

20. The WLGA is unclear on this proposal. Will this set of policies have development plan status? Will they replace or expand upon the policies already in Planning Policy Wales?

Q7. Do you agree that the proposed development hierarchy will help to ensure that planning applications are dealt with in a proportionate way dependent on their likely benefits and impacts?

21. The WLGA understands that Welsh Government is undertaking an exercise to quantify the scale of this new tier of Development of National Significance given that these projects could arise through the Natural Resources Management Plan, Transport Plan and others. For this reason, we think it is premature to agree or disagree with this proposal. However, we offer a number of observations as below.

22. If the numbers of Developments of National Significance are relatively low, we would question the need to establish new processes which could add to public perception of bureaucracy and complexity. The WLGA would propose to explore an ATLAS type approach for the larger applications where support is available to LPAs from an external team or at the least to provide a training programme for planning officers to

equip them with the necessary project management skills necessary for dealing with such applications.

23. Evidence collated by WG highlighted significant delays in the system due to lack of information provided by the applicant and delays with statutory consultees responses. There are proposals in Positive Planning to address some of these issues and we would suggest that if these proposals were introduced it would enable the local planning authority to determine the application in a more timely manner without the need to introduce this additional tier of development of national significance.

24. With regards to permitted development between use class orders the WLGA would request that any future review considers a separate use class order for 'pay day loan' shops. At present they are grouped together with banks, building societies and estate agents. This hampers local authorities in their attempts to stop the spread of these establishments. WLGA would like to see the introduction of a separate use class order specifically for this type of establishments which would make it easier for planning authorities to restrict their impact.

Q8. Do you agree with the proposed categories and thresholds for Developments of National Significance set out in Annex B?

25. The comments in response to Q7 are relevant.

Q9. Do you agree with the proposed categories and thresholds for Major Developments set out in Annex B?

26. The WLGA considers that there is merit in introducing a "major major" category (title to be agreed) which would capture the larger major developments and would have a longer determination period of 24 weeks. The proposals in relation to DNS on mandatory pre application notification, consultation with stakeholders should apply. The performance on the determination of "major major" applications would be captured in the performance regime.

Q10. Do you agree DNS applications should be subject to mandatory pre-application notification and consultation?

27. If DNS is introduced setting out the requirements regarding pre application notification and consultation should improve the quality of the application. However, this proposal is applicable to major applications as well.

Q11. Do you agree that a fee should be charged for pre-application advice for prospective DNS application?

28. Yes a fee should be charged and a proportion of this fee should be passed to LPAs for their involvement in the process – pre-application advice, compilation of a Local Impact Report and other activities associated with the determination of DNS and

monitoring and evaluation processes. Payment should also be made for the discharge of conditions.

29. Currently LPAs do not receive any fee for their involvement in NSIP applications and the amount of work is significant. Thankfully the number of NSIP applications is few in number. If the DNS tier is introduced on a similar no fee basis, this will have a serious impact on LPA finances and their ability to be involved as Positive Planning proposes.

30. The IAG report recommended that "Provision is made in relation to nationally significant infrastructure projects determined by Welsh Ministers for the fee structure to recognise the resource implications for local planning authorities in their role as principal consultees in relation to the discharge of conditions and in the enforcement of development consents once granted". We support this.

Q12. Do you agree that the Planning Inspectorate Wales is the most appropriate body to undertake the processing of a DNS application?

31. The Planning Inspectorate would appear to be the most appropriate body for the processing of Development of National Significance applications. However, PINS would need to be appropriately and adequately resourced so that the new responsibilities do not negatively impact on existing responsibilities in relation for example LDP, CIL examinations and that the Planning Inspectorate Wales employs staff with the necessary skills to negotiate to bring about the best possible development.

Q13. Do you agree that only one round of amendments to an application for DNS should be permitted after it has been formally registered?

32. Given the significance of these national schemes, it is imperative that the best schemes are approved and built. We would question whether allowing one round of amendments is over restrictive and process driven although we can understand WG's desire to encourage applicants to submit good schemes in the first instance. In practice one round of amendments may not be desirable as that amendment may introduce new issues that require subsequent amendments to other parts of the scheme.

Q14. Do you agree with the proposals for handling connected consents?

33. Without exact definitions of what is considered a connected consent we cannot comment fully on this proposal. There is an argument that if the development is ancillary to a DNS it is not, by definition nationally significant and the determining authority should therefore be the LPA. At the most WG should have a reserve power to take over connected consents where it has a legitimate concern that the LPA is not going to deal with the application in an appropriate fashion. Clearly WG already has its call-in powers, so arguably it does not in fact need an additional reserve power.

Q15. Do you agree that examination should follow a similar procedure to that proposed for call-ins and appeals?

34. No. It is imperative that the public have a voice in the determination of DNS and that the procedure encourages involvement. The WLGA would prefer the NSIP examination procedure via hearings which seek to be more consensual rather than examinations which can be adversarial and daunting for many parties. If a call-in procedure is to be adopted, targets for determination should be set to ensure an efficient service, together with appropriate mechanisms to monitor conformity with these targets.

Q16. Do you agree with the proposed division of responsibilities between the Welsh Ministers and the local planning authority at the post-determination stage?

35. Partly agree. The LPA responsibilities post-determination, including monitoring of conditions should be fully funded. If these responsibilities are not fully funded then the responsibility should rest with PINS.

Q17. Do you agree that the statement of case and draft statement of common ground should be produced when submitting an appeal?

36. Partly agree. There is merit in producing a statement of case but we are not convinced that the benefits of producing a statement of common ground outweigh the resources required to do so.

Q18. Do you agree that the Planning Inspectorate should decide how to handle the examination of an appeal?

37. Yes we agree that the ability of the Planning Inspector to determine how to handle the examination of an appeal and this would enable the appeal process to be proportionate.

Q19. Do you agree no changes should be made to the content of an application once an appeal has been submitted?

38. Yes we agree with this proposal as it should improve the efficiency of the process

Q20. Do you agree with the proposal for the Welsh Ministers to initiate awards of costs?

39. We would propose that the Inspector offers a 'minded to award' decision to allow both parties to respond.

Q21. Should fees be introduced to cover the costs of the Welsh Ministers associated with an appeal?

40. The WLGA would welcome clarity on the rationale for this proposal. If this is to resource PINS then a proposal for a fee to accompany appeals would be more transparent enabling all parties to understand the costs involved rather than having costs awarded on an appeal by appeal basis. This proposal has cost implications for LPAs and it would be preferable to understand the costs upfront rather than on an appeal by appeal basis.

Q22. Do you agree that a Commercial Appeals Service (CAS) should be introduced?

41. Yes we agree with this proposal as the similar HAS works well.

Improving Collaboration

Q23. Do you agree that local planning authorities should be merged to create larger units?

42. The merger of planning authorities should be based on a sound business case rather than a blanket policy of merger to create larger units. It does not necessarily follow that larger organisations deliver the improvements in service expected.

43. It is difficult to divorce the proposals in Positive Planning from the recommendations from the Williams Commission, which will result in larger LPAs. The WLGA would expect that if any mergers were to take place prior to local government reorganisation that they would be in line with the proposals being taken forward following the Williams Commission report.

Q24. Do you think that a National Park Authority should continue to have responsibility for planning in its area?

44. For NPAs that straddle a number of local authorities it would be challenging for local authorities to develop and implement planning policy in a consistent manner which could add to confusion and frustration for applicants.

45. Planning is also a major function for the NPAs and without this function it would be difficult for NPAs to continue delivering the remaining functions. There is no consistent evidence for removing the planning function from NPAs.

46. The Williams Commission did not receive any compelling evidence to abolish national parks but recommended closer working and sharing of back room services. In their report they acknowledged the need for local accountability for matters such as planning decisions.

Q25. Do you agree that strategic development plans should only be prepared in certain areas?

47. The suggested areas of Swansea and Cardiff complement initiatives such as City Regions. However, whether the SDP would be co-terminous with the City Region boundaries is subject to the evidence base and the proposal put to the Minister. The A55 Corridor is heavily influenced by activity in England and therefore any SDP for this area would have to be mindful of the Planning Policy in the wider Deeside area.

48. In light of the Williams Commission and the likely move to larger authorities, the 3 proposed areas may need review. It is right that the areas are not defined in primary legislation. The WLGA would welcome clarification on the relationship between the Strategic Development Plan and the Regional Economic Strategies produced by the Regional Partnership Boards and also the emerging City Region boards and their priorities.

49. The preparation of an evidence base for an SDP will require the commissioning of regional evidence. LPAs are not in a position to fund this and would seek clarification on the availability of a PIF type fund for SDP preparation.

Q26. Do you agree that the scope of SDPs should be limited to the key issues identified in paragraph 5.29?

50. The SDPs will vary to take account of local conditions, therefore a limitation of key issues is not supported. A minimum list is acceptable with LPAs able include additional issues as local circumstances dictate.

Q27. Do you agree that a partnership between local planning authorities and social, economic and environmental stakeholders should oversee preparation of SDPs?

51. The preparation of SDPs should be the responsibility of the constituent local authorities. Stakeholders can be part of the preparation process, however these stakeholders do not have a democratic mandate and therefore should be part of the 'Panel' in an advisory capacity only not in a voting capacity. It is our understanding that the Panel could be set up as a planning authority and therefore could determine strategic planning applications. This approach would not be supported and the development management function should be retained at the local authority level.

52. The selection of representative social, economic and environmental stakeholders is likely to be extremely difficult and perceived unfair advantage and undue influence could be given to a few organisations. We would question how WG will ensure that the one third 'partner representatives' will be suitably trained (if councillors have to have mandatory training), operate without vested interest and operate within the spirit of the councillors code of conduct? Also, are there going to be any democratic checks in the system to ensure that decisions not just need agreement by majority of panel, but perhaps also a majority of the elected member representatives as well. We would also seek clarification on the scrutiny of the SDP. Currently scrutiny committees can scrutinise the preparation of LDPs, who will scrutinise the preparation of the SDP?

53. With the formation of the Panel and the preparation of SDPs, there is a potential for duplication and confusion with other boards such as the City Region Boards. The WLGA would welcome a statement from WG on the framework/hierarchy for regional spatial planning given the DEST responsibilities for City Regions and Transport Plans (which are to have a regional dimension). The hierarchy of regional plans/strategies should be consistent and not solved by a local arrangement.

Q28. Do you agree that a light touch LDP focusing on matters of local significance should be prepared in areas where there is a SDP?

54. The timeline for the production of the LDPs and SDPs is not clear. Would all LDPs in a SDP area need to be completed prior to embarking on a SDP and then would the completion of a SDP trigger a review of the LDPs? Also the WLGA does not agree that the existence of SDPs would result in a LDP becoming a 'light touch' plan. If a 'light touch' LDP is to be a land use allocation document this would still require difficult local decisions regarding allocation of sites regardless of whether for example the total number of houses has been agreed strategically.

55. If the preparation and adoption of an SDP triggers a review of the LDPs in the areas covered by the SDP this could be a difficult message for staff and stakeholders to commence the process again and commit significant resources potentially very soon after the adoption of the LDP.

Improving Local Delivery

Q29. Do you agree with the essential elements of a good planning service identified in Annex A?

56. In conjunction with the DataUnit Wales, the WLGA has been supporting POSW in the development of suitable indicators to represent the elements of a good planning service. We support the continuation of this partnership working to arrive at a set of indicators which measure the breadth of the planning service.

57. We do not support indicators that measure performance above the statutory requirement, this is not realistic. In other service areas, we understand WG has accepted that improvement is maintaining the same level of service with fewer resources.

Q30. Do you agree that each LPA should produce and publish an annual performance report to agreed standards?

58. The WLGA can see merit in the preparation of an annual performance report and the Heads of Planning Scotland (HoPS) has recently developed such a report used for self improvement. This has broad categories and allows a fair degree of flexibility to reflect the characteristics of the differing authorities. It is very much a tool for self reflection and improvement not a tool for penalising performance.

59. The WLGA would support the observations in the IAG report that acknowledged that there is insufficient reward for good performance. However, we do not see that the proposals in Positive Planning rectify this. There are many proposals relating to measurement and sanctions but no incentives to drive improvement.

60. We would not want to see the APR used to penalise LPAs. We would welcome clarification on the relationship between the good planning authority indicators, Annual Performance Report (APR), SD indicators, LDP Annual Monitoring Report and the raft of other indicators collected on the planning service and what is to be used to determine poor performance.

61. Paragraph 6.13 states that statutory consultees will be subject to the preparation of a performance report and we welcome this. This requirement should be extended to Welsh Government and to the private planning consultancies. At a number of consultation events surrounding the Positive Planning report, employees of planning consultancies have accepted their role in improving the planning system and infer that their performance/improvement should be measured.

Q31. Do you agree that where an LPA is designated as poorly performing there should be an option to submit planning applications for major development to Welsh Ministers?

62. We do not agree with this proposal. Incentives to improve should be considered rather than sanctions. It seems perverse to penalise poor performing authorities with the removal of major applications and the large fees associated with them. This will inevitably lead to financial pressure and possibly job losses which will only exacerbate the performance issues.

Q32. Do you agree that Welsh Ministers should be able to direct the preparation of a joint LDP?

63. There should be robust evidence before this power is used. Local government reorganisation will in all likelihood result in this power not being used.

Q33. Do you agree that LDPs should plan for at least 15 years ahead and have a set end date beyond which they cease to be the development plan?

64. For consistency it may be appropriate to have a 20 years time frame as proposed for the NDF. We would agree with a set end date as long as the other tiers of plan are in place.

Q34. Do you agree that LPAs should work with town and community councils to produce place plans which can be adopted as supplementary planning guidance?

65. Wales does not have complete coverage of Town & Community Councils and the capacity and skills of the existing Town & Community Councils varies considerably.

We support the proposal to run a number of pilot projects and would suggest that any decision regarding Place Plans is made following the evaluation of these pilot projects.

66. This proposal has the potential to be massively resource intensive if it is to be carried out in a meaningful way. LPAs do not have surplus resource for such an undertaking. It could be argued that WG and LPAs should focus on engagement with communities (including Town & Community Councils) during the preparation of the NDF, SDP and LDP rather than introducing another tier of plan.

Q35. Do you agree that where a development plan accords with an allocation in an adopted development plan a new planning application process should be introduced, to ensure that only matters of detail such as design and layout are considered?

67. We agree, this will promote ownership and greater understanding of the purpose of the LDP.

Q36. Do you support the proposal to allow a right of appeal against an LPA not registering a planning application?

68. Yes. If one of the aims of the Bill is to create certainty in the planning system, this would achieve that aim and potentially address situtations where an impasse has been created by an LPA's decision not to validate an application. The introduction of this measure would require LPAs to be clear in terms of information required to validate applications.

Q37. Should the requirement for mandatory design and access statements be removed?

69. Yes, we agree that the requirement for mandatory design and access statements should be removed. Where appropriate, such issues could be discussed in pre-application discussions.

Q38. Should the requirement to advertise planning applications for certain developments in a local newspaper be removed?

70. Yes this requirement should be removed as newspaper advertisements are costly and savings from the removal of this requirement would be welcome in the current climate. LPAs publish planning application lists on their websites with many uploading applications, supporting documentation and decisions.

Q39. Should there be any local variation within a national scheme of delegation for decision making on applications?

71. It is not possible to agree or disagree without seeing what is proposed with regards to a national scheme of delegation. The WLGA would welcome further discussion with Welsh Government on the proposals to be taken forward as a result of the

Fortismere report including a national scheme of delegation, size of committee, training and procedures. We have extensive experience with regards to member training.

Q40. Do you agree that a minor material change should be restricted to "one whose scaled and nature results in a development which is not substantially different from that which has been approved"?

72. This is open to interpretation and will introduce confusion. Each person's interpretation of material will differ. It is essential that material amendments are defined in some way.

Q41. Do you agree that the proposals strike a balance between the need to preserve land used as Town and Village Greens and providing greater certainty for developers?

73. The Commons Act has been used inappropriately to prevent development and these proposals are an appropriate response to address the matter.

Q42. Do you agree that the proposals will reduce delay in the planning enforcement system?

74. Yes we agree with that these proposals will improve performance of the enforcement process.

Q43. Do you agree with the introduction of temporary stop notices to the planning enforcement system in Wales?

75. Yes we agree this proposal and would welcome the introduction at the earliest opportunity.

For further information please contact:

Jane Lee, Policy Officer
Jane.lee@wlga.gov.uk

Welsh Local Government Association
Local Government House
Drake walk
Cardiff
CF10 4LG

Tel: 029 2046 8600

Y Pwyllgor Amgylchedd a Chynaliadwyedd

Lleoliad:	**Ystafell Bwyllgora 3 – y Senedd**
Dyddiad:	**Dydd Mercher, 12 Chwefror 2014**
Amser:	**09.35 – 12.00**

Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru
National Assembly for Wales

Gellir gwylio'r cyfarfod ar Senedd TV yn:
http://www.senedd.tv/archiveplayer.jsf?v=cy_400000_12_02_2014&t=0&l=cy

Cofnodion Cryno:

Aelodau'r Cynulliad:	**Dafydd Elis-Thomas (Cadeirydd)** **Mick Antoniw** **Russell George** **Llyr Gruffydd** **Julie James** **Julie Morgan** **William Powell** **Joyce Watson**
Tystion:	**Anne Meikle, WWF Cymru** **Julian Rosser, Oxfam Cymru** **Cathrin Daniel, Cymorth Cristnogol** **Robin Crag Farrar, Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg** **Sarah Dawson, Llywodraeth Cymru** **Neil Hemmington, Llywodraeth Cymru** **Dion Thomas, Llywodraeth Cymru** **Rosemary Thomas, Llywodraeth Cymru**
Staff y Pwyllgor:	**Alun Davidson (Clerc)** **Catherine Hunt (Dirprwy Glerc)** **Graham Winter (Ymchwilydd)** **Chloe Corbyn (Ymchwilydd)**

TRAWSGRIFIAD
Gweld trawsgrifiad o'r cyfarfod.

1 Cyflwyniad, ymddiheuriadau a dirprwyon

1.1 Cafwyd ymddiheuriadau gan Antoinette Sandbach. Nid oedd unrhyw ddirprwyon.

2 Bil Cenedlaethau'r Dyfodol - Tystiolaeth gan Gynghrair y Trydydd Sector

2.1 Bu'r tystion yn ateb cwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

3 Papurau i'w nodi

Llythyr gan y Llywydd - Effeithiolrwydd Pwyllgorau wrth wneud gwaith craffu ar y Gyllideb

3.1 Nododd y Pwyllgor y llythyr a chytunodd i ysgrifennu at y Llywydd.

Llythyr gan y Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd - Llythyr Cylch Gwaith Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru

3.2 Nododd y Pwyllgor y llythyr a chytunodd i ysgrifennu at y Gweinidog.

Ymateb Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru i ymgynghoriad Llywodraeth Cymru ar y cynllun drafft ar gyfer Coridor yr M4 Corridor o amgylch Casnewydd

3.3 Nododd y Pwyllgor y llythyr a chytunodd i ysgrifennu at Weinidog yr Economi, Gwyddoniaeth a Thrafnidiaeth.

4 Cynnig o dan Reol Sefydlog 17.42 i benderfynu gwahardd y cyhoedd o'r cyfarfod ar gyfer eitem 5

4.1 Cytunodd y Pwyllgor ar y cynnig.

5 Bil Cynllunio (Cymru) Drafft - Sesiwn friffio ffeithiol gan swyddogion Llywodraeth Cymru

5.1 Atebodd y swyddogion gwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

Y Pwyllgor Amgylchedd a Chynaliadwyedd

Lleoliad:	**Canolfan Cynhadleddau Medrus, Prifysgol Aberystwyth**
Dyddiad:	**Dydd Iau, 20 Chwefror 2014**
Amser:	**10.00 – 13.00**

Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru
National Assembly for Wales

Gellir gwylio'r cyfarfod ar Senedd TV yn:
<insert link here>

Cofnodion Cryno:

Aelodau'r Cynulliad:	**Dafydd Elis-Thomas (Cadeirydd)** **Mick Antoniw** **Russell George** **Llyr Gruffydd** **Julie James** **Julie Morgan** **Joyce Watson**
Tystion:	**Professor Iain Donnison, Sefydliad y Gwyddorau Biolegol, Amgylcheddol a Gwledig** **Gary Douch, Cyswllt Ffermio** **Professor Janet Dwyer, Sefydliad Ymchwil Cefn Gwlad a Chymunedau** **Professor Jamie Newbold, Sefydliad y Gwyddorau Biolegol, Amgylcheddol a Gwledig** **Dr Shaun Russell, Canolfan Ymchwil Amgylcheddol Cymru** **Chris Short, Sefydliad Ymchwil Cefn Gwlad a Chymunedau** **Eirwen Williams, Menter a Busnes**
Staff y Pwyllgor:	**Alun Davidson (Clerc)** **Catherine Hunt (Dirprwy Glerc)** **Elfyn Henderson (Ymchwilydd)**

TRAWSGRIFIAD
Gweld trawsgrifiad o'r cyfarfod.

1 Cyflwyniad, ymddiheuriadau a dirprwyon

1.1 Cafwyd ymddiheuriadau gan William Powell ac Antoinette Sandbach. Nid oedd dirprwyon ar eu rhan.

2 Rheoli Tir yn Gynaliadwy – Tystiolaeth gan Sefydliad y Gwyddorau Biolegol, Amgylcheddol a Gwledig (IBERS), Prifysgol Aberystwyth

2.1 Bu'r tystion yn ateb cwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

3 Rheoli Tir yn Gynaliadwy – Tystiolaeth gan Cyswllt Ffermio

3.1 Bu'r tystion yn ateb cwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

4 Rheoli Tir yn Gynaliadwy – Tystiolaeth gan Ganolfan Ymchwil Amgylcheddol Cymru

4.1 Bu Dr Russell yn ymateb i gwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

4.2 Cytunodd Dr Russell i ddarparu manylion ar gynlluniau datblygu tramor.

5 Rheoli Tir yn Gynaliadwy – Tystiolaeth gan y Sefydliad Ymchwil Cefn Gwlad a Chymunedau (CCRI), Prifysgol Swydd Gaerloyw

5.1 Bu'r tystion yn ateb cwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

5.2 Cytunodd yr Athro Dwyer i ddarparu gwybodaeth ar rôl Llywodraeth Cymru mewn perthynas â chasglu data.

6 Papurau i'w nodi

6.1 Nododd y Pwyllgor y cofnodion.

Ymchwiliad i Gynigion Llywodraeth Cymru ar gyfer yr M4 ger Casnewydd: Llythyr gan Weinidog yr Economi, Gwyddoniaeth a Thrafnidiaeth
6.2 Nododd y Pwyllgor y llythyr.

Y Pwyllgor Amgylchedd a Chynaliadwyedd

Lleoliad:	**Ystafell Bwyllgora 3 – y Senedd**
Dyddiad:	**Dydd Mercher, 5 Mawrth 2014**
Amser:	**09.35 – 12.05**

Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru
National Assembly for Wales

Gellir gwylio'r cyfarfod ar Senedd TV yn:
http://www.senedd.tv/archiveplayer.jsf?v=cy_400000_05_03_2014&t=0&l=cy

Cofnodion Cryno:

Aelodau'r Cynulliad:	**Dafydd Elis-Thomas (Cadeirydd)** **Mick Antoniw** **Keith Davies** **Russell George** **Llyr Gruffydd** **Julie James** **Julie Morgan** **William Powell** **Antoinette Sandbach**
Tystion:	**Alun Davies, Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd** **Christianne Glossop, Y Prif Swyddog Milfeddygol, Llywodraeth Cymru** **Dean Medcraft, Llywodraeth Cymru** **Matthew Quinn, Llywodraeth Cymru** **Andrew Slade, Llywodraeth Cymru**
Staff y Pwyllgor:	**Alun Davidson (Clerc)** **Catherine Hunt (Dirprwy Glerc)** **Elfyn Henderson (Ymchwilydd)** **Martin Jennings (Ymchwilydd)**

TRAWSGRIFIAD
Gweld trawsgrifiad o'r cyfarfod.

1 Cyflwyniad, ymddiheuriadau a dirprwyon

1.1 Cafwyd ymddiheuriadau gan Joyce Watson. Roedd Keith Davies yn bresennol fel dirprwy.

1.2 Gwnaeth y Cadeirydd ddatganiad mewn ymateb i adroddiad y Comisiwn ar Ddatganoli yng Nghymru.

2 Craffu ar waith y Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd - Sesiwn graffu ariannol

2.1 Ymatebodd y Gweinidog a'i swyddogion i gwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

2.2 Cytunodd y Gweinidog i ysgrifennu at y Pwyllgor gyda rhagor o wybodaeth am y cynllun iawndal ar gyfer y diwydiant pysgota yn sgîl difrod y stormydd diweddar.

3 Craffu ar waith y Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd - Sesiwn graffu gyffredinol

3.1 Ymatebodd Gweinidog a'i swyddogion i gwestiynau gan aelodau'r Pwyllgor.

3.2 Cytunodd y Gweinidog i ddarparu manylion am nifer y contractau Glastir a ddosbarthwyd i ffermwyr erbyn 1 Ionawr 2014, ac am nifer y contractau a ddychwelwyd hyd yn hyn.

3.3 Cytunodd y Gweinidog i ddarparu manylion am sylwadau'r Pwyllgor ynghylch casglu deunydd ailgylchu i fwrdd polisi'r Gweinidog ar ailgylchu.

4 Papurau i'w nodi

Llythyr gan y Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd - Ymateb i'r argymhellion yn adroddiad rhywogaethau goresgynnol estron y pwyllgor

4.1 Nododd y Pwyllgor ymateb Llywodraeth Cymru.

Llythyr gan y Gweinidog Cyfoeth Naturiol a Bwyd - Y wybodaeth ddiweddar ynghylch diogelu arfordir Cymru

4.2 Nododd y Pwyllgor y llythyr.