

*Confidential*

# ADAS

**ASSESSMENT OF DATA SUBMITTED BY LAMMAS LOW  
IMPACT INITIATIVES Ltd  
FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT  
AT PANTYGAFEL, GLANDWR, PEMBS**

**Prepared for**

**Planning Department  
Pembrokeshire County Council  
County Hall  
Haverfordwest  
Pembrokeshire  
SA61 1TP**

**Prepared by:**

---

**Aled Roberts and Chris Creed  
ADAS  
Henstaffe Business Court  
Groesfaen  
Cardiff  
CF72 8NG**

**Date: 20/08/08**

**Tel: 01267 220350**

**Email: [Aled.Roberts@adas.co.uk](mailto:Aled.Roberts@adas.co.uk)**

## CONTENTS

	<b>Paragraph</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>SUMMARY</b>	2
<b>RESOURCES &amp; LAND QUALITY</b>	3
<b>EVALUATION OF DATA PROVIDED</b>	4
<b>Business plan</b>	4.1
<b>Water use</b>	4.2
<b>Energy needs</b>	4.3
<b>VIABILITY AND FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENT OF BASIC HOUSEHOLD NEEDS</b>	5
<b>Plots 1- 9</b>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	6

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This is second assessment of the data submitted by members of Lamas Low Impact Initiatives Ltd. It aims to evaluate the data and viability of the proposed businesses in terms of meeting paragraphs 5, 6 & 7.

“The proposal requires a countryside location and is tied directly to the land on which it is located and involves agriculture, forestry or horticulture”.

“The proposal will provide sufficient livelihood for and substantially meet the needs of residents on the site”, and also paragraph 7.

“The number of adult residents should be directly related to the functional requirements of the enterprise”, as detailed in Supplementary Planning Guidance- Low Impact Development Making a Positive Contribution prepared under the Joint Unitary Development Plan for Pembrokeshire.

The proposal encapsulates 9 separate families business plans resubmitted for the land and woodland area at Pantygafel farm, Glandwr, Pembrokeshire. The intention is to farm the land using broadly Permaculture methods.

The report is based on information provided to ADAS by Pembrokeshire County Councils Planning Department, following revision to the first application which was submitted in 2007.

## 2. SUMMARY

- 1 The details supplied by plot holders are very similar in terms of energy use in terms of wood and other short term coppice use, thus following a guide template which could underestimate each individuals own family needs.
- 2 The capital cost for each plot development shows considerable differences in build cost which in some cases could be considerably more than the budgeted figures used in the respective plans. This would have an implication on each plot holders financial position.
- 3 It is accepted that a low impact development will have lower energy demands when compared with conventional development although figures used in the budgets are very low especially for those with young families and larger families which require more heat, and general electricity consumption to maintain basic needs.
- 4 The budgets show low household needs in all cases which can be considered in today's society considerably below what would be expected to be needed to maintain “basic needs”. The figures used are low and are instrumental in enabling plot holders to meet the guidelines as specified in Policy 52 Low Impact Development.

- 5 The sale value of products from the development can be considered high in most cases, and not realistic in terms of what can be achieved. The high "added value" achieved in most of the budgets are crucial in enabling plot holders to achieve on paper sufficient income to meet the proposed sustainable livelihood level. Achieving the budgeted figures will prove to be difficult.
- 6 Comparative figures available from DEFRA have been used to compare the horticultural and agricultural elements of the permaculture proposal.
- 7 It is of the opinion that figures used in the budgeted income and outputs in most cases are above "realistic" figures achievable and would need to be reduced to more appropriate levels for comparison purposes.
- 8 The funding streams for the Hub development is unsecured and reliant on the sale of shares, and additional capital funding which may not materialise.
- 9 It is suggested that the power generation to the plots and the hub can be met from the hydro proposal, and no need for an abstraction licence. This needs to be followed up with the Environment agency as to the legal position.
- 10 The conclusions drawn as to meeting paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of Policy 52, are referred to in section 6 of the report.

### 3. RESOURCES AND LAND QUALITY

The planning application is based on land comprising of up to 76 acres at Pantygafel farm. This land is presently under permanent pasture together with a woodland area to the Northwest of the 9 proposed development plots.

The DEFRA land classification system categorises the land as ranging from grade 1 to 5 is grade 4.

This description for grade 4 land is

"Poor quality Agricultural land which has severe limitations which significantly restrict the range of crops and or level of yields. It is mostly suited to grass with occasional arable crops e.g. cereals and forage crops, the yields of which are variable. In moist climates yields of grass may be moderate to high but there may be difficulties in utilisation. The grade also includes very droughty arable land".

The majority of land falls under the MANOD soil series which are soils derived on Palaeozoic slate and mudstone and siltstone. The soil character is described as well drained fine loamy or fine silty soils over rock, shallow in places with bare rock locally, and steep slopes common. This land type is linked traditionally to stock rearing and woodland in the upland areas.

There is also an area of land which falls under the WILCOCKS1 soil series. These are soils derived on Palaeozoic sandstone mudstone and shale. It is a slowly permeable