

# LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## Sustainability Group

**Meeting 11**  
**9 April 2008**

### **Record of Meeting**

#### **Attendance**

Phil Griffiths  
Dave Lucas  
Alison Palmer  
Neil Maylan  
Steve Martin  
Paul Cooke

Caerphilly CBC (Countryside)  
Caerphilly CBC (Forward Planning)  
GAVO  
Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust  
Caerphilly CBC (Energy)  
Caerphilly CBC (Sustainability)

#### **Apologies**

Richard Jones  
Caroline Drayton  
Gemma Thomas  
Alison Jones  
Pat Martin  
Ryan Bowen  
Stanley Evelyn  
Melanie Phillips  
Rhian Kyte

Countryside Council For Wales  
Environment Agency (Wales)  
Caerphilly CBC (Highways)  
Caerphilly CBC (Ecology)  
Caerphilly CBC (Conservation)  
Welsh Water  
BT  
Caerphilly CBC (Econ Dev)  
Caerphilly CBC (Planning)



REGENERATION

THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT

EDUCATION FOR LIFE

HEALTH SOCIAL CARE & WELL BEING



## Outcomes For The Meeting

1. To agree the assessment and record from the previous meeting.
2. To widen the assessment base to generic development control policies for the LDP

## Introduction To Meeting And Update From Last Meeting

The group were advised that the Council officer group had continued the assessment process of the Strategic Policies that the Sustainability Group had commenced at the previous meeting. Those assessments had finally concluded the week of the SG meeting and the Officer Group would continue with the assessments of the County Wide Policies following on from this meeting.

The full record of the Strategic Policy assessment, which was undertaken by the SG, was appended to the Record of the meeting, along with commentary on the policy by officers. It was confirmed that the full results from the Strategic and Countywide Policy assessments would be presented to the SG once they had been formally recorded.

The Record of the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the SG was agreed without amendment, including the Assessment and commentary on policy SP21 – Transport Infrastructure Improvement.

As a final matter the EA had supplied proposed wording for Assessment Tests Nos. 50 and 51, which were considered by the SG.

	Proposed EA wording	Amendments By SG	Reason For Changes
50	Where groundwater conditions allow does it encourage the use of sustainable drainage systems	Where groundwater conditions allow does it <u>seek to maximise permeable surfaces and</u> encourage the use of sustainable drainage systems	Whilst the encouragement of the use of sustainable drainage systems is agreed the council stance of non-adoption would result in a test that would drive no useful benefit to the LDP. In addition the issue has surrounded the dual role of permeable surfaces and SUDS. Linking these two issues together results in a more robust and useful test.
51	Does it provide the opportunity to reduce the risk of flooding to people and property	Does it <del>provide the opportunity to</del> reduce the risk of flooding to people and property	It was generally thought that most proposals had the “opportunity” to reduce the risk, but the test should relate to whether this is actually delivered. Consequently the test is amended to provide a more direct and robust test.

## 32 Assess County Wide Policies from Version 3 Emerging Deposit LDP

- 32.1 PG and DL gave a brief introduction and outline to the group for the assessment of the County Wide Policy (CWP) [Policy CW1 – Climate Change], noting that the policies were essentially a Development Control policy list whose purpose was to control development throughout the county borough. The policies, therefore, are to be applied equally, throughout the county borough to all forms of development where they are applicable.

- 32.2 The procedure for producing the LDP advocates against producing topic based policies. Consequently the CWPs are composites of topic-based criteria that accord with a general theme [as in the assessed policy, matters relating to climate change are included irrespective of land use or topic]. As a result the policies are multi-faceted and need to be considered in totality in order to establish an appropriate assessment. It was to be noted that it may be the case that some elements within a policy may conflict and this needed to be raised in the issues/comments part of the assessment.
- 32.3 The SG undertook the assessment of Policy CW1 – Climate Change, the results of which are included as Appendix 1 to this Record.

The meeting closed upon conclusion of the assessment.

# Appendix 1 – Assessment of Policy CW1

Policy/Proposal No: CW 1		Assessing Officers: SG				Date: 11 April 2008	
Assessment Test	Nature of Effect	Predicted Effect				Comments	
		Additional Effects	Assessment of Effect				
			Effect Period				
S/T	M/T	L/T	Analysis Any Mitigation Measures Assumptions				
1	Will it reduce the need to travel?		●	●	●	• Locational decisions are key.	
2	Will it encourage walking as the mode of travel to local amenities due to the proximity of development to existing services/facilities?		●	●	●	• Locational decisions are key.	
3	Will it promote reduced resource use?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	•
4	Will it maximise the production or use of renewable materials?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	• Maximise use only
5	Will it help sustain the local community?		●	●	●	•	
6	Does it promote a mix of housing types?		●	●	●	•	
7	Does it provide affordable housing?		●	●	●	•	
8	Does it help protect or improve housing stock?		●	●	●	•	
9	Will it remove derelict land? (brownfield)	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	• Breeam criteria encourages brownfield development
10	Will it help promote or sustain educational establishments?		●	●	●	•	
11	Will it meet the educational needs of local people?		●	●	●	•	
12	Will it enable skills progression?		Secondary	●	●	●	• Renewable energy technologies
13	Will it increase the levels of participation and attainment in education?		Secondary	●	●	●	• Sustainable design educational buildings achieve higher educational attainment
14	Does it help reduce disparities between Southern and Northern Wards?		●	●	●	•	
15	Does it consider the needs of vulnerable/minority groups?		●	●	●	•	
16	Does it provide equality of access to services?		●	●	●	•	
17	Will it provide jobs in accessible locations by all modes?		●	●	●	•	
18	Will it support the role and function of the settlement within which it is located?		●	●	●	•	

19	Will it contribute towards a balanced range of employment sites?			●	●	●	•
20	Is it likely to encourage inward investment?			●	●	●	• Concern over whether developers would be resistant. This argument used in Merton Case but was shown that house builders used it as a significant marketing tool.
21	Will it promote business start-ups?		Secondary	●	●	●	•
22	Will it provide a broad range of jobs and employment opportunities?			●	●	●	•
23	Will it promote economic growth particularly in the most deprived areas?			●	●	●	•
24	Will it meet the employment needs of local people?			●	●	●	•
25	Will it provide facilities that will encourage residents to remain in the County Borough?	High Minor Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	• Pros and cons. More expensive to build but lower running costs. Lower running costs will realise benefit over time.
26	Will The facilities be particularly relevant to young people?			●	●	●	•
27	Is it likely to maintain a sense of community?			●	●	●	•
28	Does it provide increased accessibility to healthcare?			●	●	●	•
29	Does it encourage active and healthy lifestyles?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	• Only certain aspects of quality of life.
30	Does it provide increased accessibility to facilities for physical or recreational activities?			●	●	●	•
31	Does it protect quality of life for the residents?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	•
32	Will it help reduce health inequalities in the community?			●	●	●	• Applies across all housing, including affordable housing
33	Will it promote design that discourages crime and helps reduce fear of crime?			●	●	●	• Should be in the LDP - need to review Policy CW4.
34	Is it likely to improve air quality within a designated air quality management area?		Secondary	●	●	●	• The secondary effects are close to significant but overall not significant enough to warrant a positive result.
35	Will it maintain or improve local air quality?		Secondary	●	●	●	• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage • Should be part of detailed design policy (CW 4)
36	Is it likely to increase light pollution?		Secondary	●	●	●	•
37	Is it likely to increase noise pollution?			●	●	●	•
38	Is it likely to increase odour pollution?			●	●	●	•
39	Does it promote high standards of design that reflect local character and distinctiveness?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	×	×	×	• Potential conflict between innovation and traditional design

40	Will it maintain or improve landscape quality?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> <li>• Site dependant</li> </ul>
41	Is it likely to adversely affect an area of landscape importance?			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site dependant</li> </ul>
42	Is it likely to adversely affect a building, structure or area of heritage importance?			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site dependant</li> </ul>
43	Will it improve the range and quality of cultural, sporting and leisure facilities?			●	●	●	•
44	Will it promote the use of the Welsh language?			●	●	●	•
45	Will it support community development?			●	●	●	•
46	Does it adversely impact on the biological and chemical water quality in watercourses in the County Borough?	High Minor Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> </ul>
47	Will it minimise the use of water?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> <li>• Construction and use</li> </ul>
48	Is it likely to have a detrimental impact on the amount and quality of groundwater resources?	High Minor Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disbenefit of new development outweighed by requirement for sustainable drainage and permeable surfaces</li> </ul>
49	Is it located outside of an area at risk of flooding			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site dependant</li> </ul>
50	Where Groundwater conditions allow, does it seek to maximise permeable surfaces and encourage the use of sustainable drainage systems.	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> </ul>
51	Does it reduce the risk of flooding to people and property			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site dependant</li> </ul>
52	Does it protect high quality agricultural land? (1&2 &3a)			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site dependant</li> </ul>
53	Will it impact locally on recognised site of geological importance?			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site dependant</li> </ul>
54	Will it potentially reduce the amount of derelict, contaminated degraded or underused land?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> </ul>
55	Does it promote alternatives to land fill/land raise sites?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relates to re-use of materials</li> </ul>
56	Will it promote the use of recycled and secondary materials?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	•

57	Will it minimise the production of waste?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	++	++	++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction and use</li> </ul>
58	Will it provide facilities for recycling?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	++	++	++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
59	Does it protect areas of importance for biodiversity?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> <li>• Sustainable construction techniques</li> </ul>
60	Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or habitat enhancement?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> </ul>
61	Does it protect woodlands, hedgerows, trees and watercourses?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
62	Will it provide the opportunity for the reduction of invasive plant species?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
63	Does it guard against habitat fragmentation?			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
64	Will it minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	++	++	++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
65	Will it promote reduced journey length by private vehicles?		Secondary	+	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short term reduction in construction traffic due to reuse of materials</li> <li>• Otherwise site dependant</li> </ul>
66	Will it allow for carbon offsetting?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	++	++	++	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
67	Can it provide for habitat routes to allow other species to adapt to the changing environment?			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should realise positive results in conjunction with other policies in the plan</li> </ul>
68	Does it promote the use of alternative travel other than the car?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> </ul>
69	Will it deliver services and facilities in locations accessible by modes other than the car?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeam criteria on this, will encourage</li> </ul>
70	Does it provide safe routes for walking and cycling?			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
71	Will it reduce congestion through the development and improvement of the strategic transport infrastructure			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
72	Will it improve communities through the development and improvement of the strategic transport infrastructure			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
73	Does it facilitate the generation of energy from renewable sources?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stronger context in RJ will realise double positive</li> </ul>

74	Does it encourage the use of energy from renewable sources?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	• Stronger context in RJ will realise double positive
75	Does it facilitate the supply of renewable energy to the national grid?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	• Stronger context in RJ will realise double positive
76	Does it encourage energy efficiency?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	++	+++	+++	•

*Comment*

The primary finding on this policy, despite the significant positive effects it realises, is that **the policy is not as strong as it should be**. It achieves neutral or small positive responses in a number of categories where it could, and indeed should score higher. The Merton case established the validity of requiring renewable energy generation from all development sites and also established the precedent for meeting targets over and above those contained in national guidance.

The policy omits significant factors that contribute toward sustainable development and energy efficiency, such as orientation and locational decisions such as locating close to transport nodes. These factors need to be addressed through the LDP.

Criterion A needs to identify a target over and above the building regulations level, as that is a statutory requirement anyway. It is recommended that a target of 10% over and above building regulations is included.

In respect of criterion C it is not possible for some development to realise Breeam Excellent rating due to locational or other factors beyond the control of the development. As such requiring this would be unfair. Rather than weaken the policy (which is already too weak) by including an exceptions clause, it is recommended that the criterion seek Breeam Very Good rating as its target.

The Reasoned Justification should be amended to reflect that the onus would be with the developer to prove that they have designed the development to reach the targets in the policy. It will be the role of the council to ensure that they have this information before determining any proposal.

In addition to this the RJ should be amended to highlight the factors that Breeam criteria seek so that these can be addressed and considered as part of the development process.

*Recommended Changes To The Plan*

The Policy be amended by the introduction of targets over and above those in national guidance and required by statute. These will include energy efficiency levels 10% over and above that required by building regulations, and the requirement to achieve Breeam Very Good Standard rather than Excellent.

The reasoned Justification is amended by reference to the onus being on the developer to prove the criteria have been met and to highlight the factors included within Breeam that will be considered in respect of proposals for development.

Finally the LDP will need to include contributory design and layout factors to complement the overall aim of the policy. These factors need not necessarily be included in this policy but cross-reference should be made to where the factors are prescribed.