**CARMARTHENSHIRE**

**REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2018-2033)**

**EXAMINATION**
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**Monitoring Framework**

We have reviewed the Carmarthenshire Revised Local Development Plan monitoring framework. The Council is invited to consider the following questions and suggested changes to indicators:

* MI.4 – should the indicator refer to ‘vacant units of commercial properties’ because it is not just retail unit vacancies that fall within the town centre boundaries?
* MI.4 – should a baseline figure for annual monitoring be included? We suggest the vacancy levels in the Town Centre Retail Audit 2024 [CSD100] are used. Rather than cite the 2024 vacancy levels, the report could be included in the ‘Trigger Point’ column and used annually to monitor vacancy level changes.
* Several indicators refer to permissions rather than delivery (completions). We suggest they are amended to ‘delivery’ to ensure effective monitoring and consistency with other indicators. They include MI.9, MI.10, MI.18, MI.19, MI.20, MI.31, and MI.32.
* MI.11 - given the changes to Policy HOM3, we suggest amending the indicator to refer to the anticipated delivery of 264 dwellings during the Plan period, as set out in the Appendix 7 table.
* MI.21 – for clarity, the job growth indicator should refer to a target which we assume based on AP4/1 is 6,652 jobs?
* MI.33 – should the target and trigger point both refer to ‘in the County’ rather than any settlement, as the need applies county-wide?
* MI.38 – the indicator is vague. Should it be more closely worded to Policy PSD3 e.g. ‘provision of GBI in accordance with Policy PSD3’?
* MI.43 – the target and trigger point (annual vs 4-year monitoring) appear inconsistent. How do the Council envisage this indicator working?
* MI.56 – could the Council explain the aim of this indicator – is it monitoring a specific road scheme, or several schemes? Which one(s)? How does it differ from MI.58?
* MI.59 and MI.60 – suggest adding ‘in any given year’ to both trigger points, for clarity.
* MI.61 – should the indicator be reworded to align with Policy MR2 – ‘sensitive non-mineral development’?

The following are suggested new indicators, and we invite the Council’s response to each:

* Policy SP2 - would it be appropriate to have an indicator for the proportion of A1 retail uses within town centre boundaries? The Town Centre Retail Audit 2024 [CSD100] could be used as the baseline for future monitoring.
* Policy PSD7 – include an indicator to monitor the loss of community facilities contrary to policy?
* Policy PSD8 – provision of new open space – include an indicator to monitor provision against policy, with a trigger for permissions granted without sufficient open space provision?
* Policy PSD14 – include a monitoring target for schemes granted permission not in accordance with policy?
* Policy NE1 – include an indicator for biodiversity enhancements (e.g. Green Infrastructure Statements)?
* Policy CCH1 – include an indicator to monitor delivery of solar schemes and capacity within the 3 Local Search Areas?

The Council is asked to consider the above suggestions and provide a full response to each point, along with any consequential changes in an Action Points table, by **10 October** **2025**.

Lastly, the framework will need a factual update to address consequential changes to Policy numbers (e.g. BHE2), targets (because of Action Points changes) and national policy (e.g. Flood Map for Planning flood zones). These consequential changes can be made post-adoption.

If you have any questions about the content of this note, please contact us via the Programme Officer.

*Nicola Gulley and Ian Stevens*
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