

## Nettleship, Tom

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 December 2024 21:41  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** LDP2 Deposit Plan / Supplementary Planning Guidance Consultation Response

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** SPG Rep, D Rep

Dear Planning Team,

Please find my LDP 2 consultation response below. This is consistent with the response of Amroth Community Council, which I am a member of, in addition to my role as County Councillor for Amroth and Saundersfoot North.

### 1.Llanteg/ Llanteglos

The LDP 2 appears to indicate that these are two settlements. The name of Llanteg does include an area known as Llanteglos which surrounds the property known as Llanteglos on Amroth Road, Llanteg. The settlement/village is called Llanteg.

The LDP 2 also states that the village of Llanteg is to be recategorised as a service village using outdated information from the Rural Facilities Study Report 2018 and the Rural Studies Report 2020/ updated 2024. I object to this as the settlement does not accrue enough points to be classified as a Service village. The current facilities include:

- Shop that requires transport for most residents to reach. 5 points
- Village Hall – Again, the hall must be accessed by the majority of users by car as it is located on the A477 trunk road with limited pavements/ safe walking. 3 points
- Common land. The Old School Garden and the Clay Pits which constitute the common land for the village, again access mainly by car due to the rural location. – 1 point

NOTE; There is no place of worship – the church was closed over 40 years ago, and the pub has been closed for several years.

For these reasons I request that you review this decision, and recategorise Llanteg as a Local Village based on the facilities available and delete references to Llanteglos as a separate settlement.

### 2. Summerhill

It should be noted that the points awarded for a public house/club in Summerhill relate to Meadow House Caravan park which is located outside the village boundary. This also should be a local village rather than a service village.

### 3. New Inn

I question why New Inn has been included as a settlement separate to Amroth. The postal addresses of the properties in the New Inn area are all Amroth and residents see it as part of Amroth village. The Amroth village sign on approaching the village from the East is located before the New Inn. I maintain that New Inn is not separate but very much part of Amroth.

Also the Amroth settlement boundary line appears to dissect a property located near the New Inn, Amroth. The house is within the boundary but the adjacent garage is outside. From a planning perspective this could complicate future planning applications. I request that the whole property is included within the settlement boundary.

#### 4. Ground Source Protection Zone

I draw your attention to the potential development (candidate) sites in Llanteg that are located fully within a defined Ground Source Protection Zone (GSPZ) for drinking water. This is not referenced within the candidate site assessment.

There is no mains drainage in the village, no year-round running watercourses and clay subsoil that prevents any foul drainage to an extent that cesspit private drainage has been mandated on properties built within the last 20 years. The 'Rural Facilities Survey 2018' and more recent reports should therefore place greater emphasis on the presence of mains sewerage and should also recognise Ground Source Protection zones to avoid an adverse impact and to be compliant with Welsh Water and Natural Resources Wales protection of Water resources.

I therefore ask that sites are reviewed and where they are within the GSPZ and that this is reflected within the site evaluation scoring matrix as it is both non-environmentally friendly (and hugely expensive) to have all wastewater removed by tanker every few weeks as is the case for existing properties bordering the proposed development site on Amroth Road, Llanteg.

The requirement for private cesspit drainage, and the space they require will also impact the number of properties to be built on development site 220 within a GSPZ. Planners must be aware of this when considering applications for development. The requirement will also impact the provision of affordable homes on these sites, as those on limited incomes will not afford the cost of frequent tank emptying.

#### 5. GN 56 Caravan, Camping and Chalet development.

The Landscape Character Areas Sensitivity and Capacity Assessments - Landscape Character Area LCA 19, Narberth and Lampeter Vale draws attention to the number of sites in and around the I wards and states that 'parts have already reached capacity including Pleasant Valley, Summerhill and surrounding areas close to the coast and National Park'.

This evidence based report is clearly the best basis for decisions about new, or extensions to existing caravan sites.

In recent years, some caravan parks in the area have changed from touring sites to the provision of static caravans or lodges. Evidence shows that there has been no reduction of pitch numbers although the statics and lodges take up more space and can accommodate a greater number of occupants. Expansion into fields previously without pitches has negatively impacted neighbours and the aesthetic from the National Park. I request that LDP 2 Tourism Policy acknowledges this, accounts for the additional space required and reduces pitch numbers as appropriate.

While current sites and visitors bring a positive impact to the local economy, further development would impact negatively on the enjoyment of the National Park. I ask that future planning decisions relating to Camping, Caravanning and Chalets development respects this and enforces appropriate screening on current sites.

Kind regards

Alec



