



Caerphilly County Borough
Local Development Plan

Hearing Session 7: Community Facilities,
Leisure and Tourism
(Tuesday 18 May 2010)

Examination 2010

Caerphilly County Borough Council submission

Examination Statement reference:

ES7.1

Submission date:

31 March 2010

Hearing Session 7: Community Facilities, Leisure and Tourism

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Topic Paper has been prepared by Caerphilly County Borough Council in order to help facilitate appropriate discussion at the relevant Hearing Session of the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan Examination. The Paper is structured in accord with the Issue and Matters Agenda set out by the Planning Inspector (Mr Alwyn Nixon), as part of the Hearing Sessions Programme and provides a succinct response to the questions raised as part of that Agenda.
- 1.2 Where the Council does not intend to provide any additional written evidence the Inspector's attention is directed to the relevant part of the Evidence Base, which in the view of the Council addresses the matters raised. The paper will not repeat evidence previously submitted for consideration.

2. Community Facilities Allocations

- ***Should site HG1.68 (St. Ilan's Comprehensive, Caerphilly) be re-used for education purposes, and allocated accordingly?***
- 2.1 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:
 - **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 173-197);
 - **SB83:** Comprehensive List of Changes (Including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp. 48-50);
 - **ED14:** Supplementary Paper FC15 – St. Ilan's Comprehensive, Caerphilly
 - ***Do the allocations for the rebuilding of Cwm Ifor Primary, Hendre Junior and St. James' Primary Schools, Caerphilly (CF1.25, CF1.27 and CF1.29) involve the use of greenfield land? If so, does this render the plan unsound?***
 - 2.2 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:
 - **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 203-205, 206-207, 297-301)
 - ***Is the proposal to remodel the former library building at Brooklands, Risca as an Adult and Youth Education Centre (CF1.38) founded on a robust evidence base?***

- 2.3 The Inspector's attention is directed to Focused Change 51 and to the following parts of the evidence base:
- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 274-283);
 - **SB83:** Comprehensive List of Changes (Including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp. 126-127)
- ***Does allocation CF1.16 (GP Surgery at Oakfield Street, Ystrad Mynach) render the plan unsound due to car parking implications?***
- 2.4 The Inspector's attention is directed to Focused Change 44 and to the following parts of the evidence base:
- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3 (pp. 443-446);
 - **SB83:** Comprehensive List of Changes (Including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp. 112-113)
- 2.5 Planning permission has recently been granted for a two-storey extension to the north of the existing facility. As part of this, the surgery car park would be extended into the adjacent public car park in order to provide the surgery with ten spaces.
- ***Is allocation CF1.9 (Proposed Fire Station, land south of Aberbargoed Plateau, Aberbargoed) founded on a robust evidence base? Does the allocation render the plan unsound?***
- 2.6 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:
- **SB58:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 2 (pp. 53-59);
 - **SB83:** Comprehensive List of Changes (Including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp. 85-86)
- 2.7 Caerphilly County Borough Council have recently approved the sale of the site to South Wales Fire and Rescue, in anticipation of an application being submitted for the development of this facility.
- ***Does allocation CF1.1 (Extension to Rhymney Cemetery) render the plan unsound?***
- 2.8 Dwr Cymru originally objected to the allocation of this site for cemetery use on the grounds that there is a public sewer running through the site. It has a statutory power to access the sewer for inspection, maintenance and repair. Such action could be regarded as being a nuisance within the context of a site utilised for such a sensitive land use, which would require the sewer to be diverted or the allocation deleted.

2.9 Officers from the Council's Strategic Planning and Bereavement Services sections have since succeeded in addressing the concerns previously held by Dwr Cymru regarding the location of the sewer. It is not believed that the sewer, which runs through the centre of the site, would impinge upon the suitability of that part of the site intended to be used as burial land. At a meeting of Council and Dwr Cymru officers in May 2009, Dwr Cymru confirmed that the allocation is indeed acceptable, provided that the site can be developed in such a way as to set access to the sewer apart from actual burial land. The Inspector's attention is directed to the following part of the evidence base:

- **SB58:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 2 (pp. 233-235)

- ***Is allocation CF1.12 (Cemetery extension, Gelligaer) sound, given its proximity to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (an area of Roman remains)?***

2.10 The Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) is outside, but adjoining, the settlement boundary at Church Road. It lies to the south of the cemetery allocation, which is situated in open countryside between the defined settlements of Gelligaer and Penpedairheol. The allocation and the SAM are separated by a buffer zone, which measures approximately 50m at its narrowest point. There is no adverse impact on the SAM from the existing cemetery, which lies closer to the SAM than the proposed extension. Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust have been fully involved in the preparation of the LDP and have not raised an objection to this proposal. Furthermore the Council's Conservation Officer has not raised an objection to the proposal and has indicated that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the SAM.

2.11 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following part of the evidence base:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3 (pp. 385-386)

3. LEISURE

- ***Should site E31 land at Pendinas Avenue, Croespenmaen be protected for informal recreation and community uses under policy LE5? Would the allocation be realistic and deliverable? Is the plan unsound as a result of the site's non-allocation?***

3.1 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base, in particular ED11:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultation – Volume 3 (pp. 53 – 56)

- **SB73:** Caerphilly LDP Statement of Focused Changes, Focus change 7 (pp. 7)
 - **SB83:** Deposit LDP up to 2021 – Comprehensive List of Changes (including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp. 21 – 24)
 - **ED11:** Agenda Item 1- paragraphs 4.7- 4.10
 - **ED11:** Agenda Item 2 – Pages 31 - 33
- ***Should site LE99.16 Old Landfill Site and Hafodyrynys be allocated for formal leisure purposes under policy LE4? Would the allocation be realistic and deliverable? Is the plan unsound as a result of the site's non-allocation?***
- 3.2 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base, in particular ED11:
- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultation – Volume 3 (pp. 106 – 108)
 - **SB73:** Caerphilly LDP Statement of Focused Changes, Focus change 8 (pp. 8)
 - **SB83:** Deposit LDP up to 2021 – Comprehensive List of Changes (including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp. 25 – 28)
 - **ED11:** Agenda Item 1- paragraphs 4.11- 4.14
 - **ED11:** Agenda Item 2 – Pages 34 - 37
- ***Should sites...be protected for informal recreation and community uses under policy LE5? Would the allocations be realistic and deliverable? Is the plan unsound as a result of the sites' non-allocation for this purpose?***

LE99.32 Ness tar Site, Caerphilly

3.3 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 354 – 364)

HG1.72 – Caerphilly Miners Hospital

3.4 [The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base](#), in particular ED11:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 379 – 383)

- **SB73:** Caerphilly LDP Statement of Focused Changes, Focus Change 16, (pp.9)
- **SB83:** Deposit LDP up to 2021: Comprehensive List of Changes (including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp.51 – 55)
- **ED11:** Agenda Item 2 – Pages 71-81

LE99.26 – Part of Venosa Trading Estate (HG1.66)

3.5 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 164 – 168)

NOTE: Please note that the correct reference number for Venosa Trading Estate is **LE99.30** and NOT LE99.26.

LE99.26 - Pontypandy Industrial Estate (HG1.67)

3.6 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 169 – 172)

- ***Should site LE99.32 Ness Tar, Caerphilly be allocated for formal leisure facilities under policy LE4? Would the allocation be realistic and deliverable? Is the plan unsound as a result of the site's non-allocation?***

3.7 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 354 – 364)

- ***Should site LE99.24 Part of land East of Wingfield Works, Llanbradach be allocated for leisure (In conjunction with allocation of remainder of site for housing?) Would the allocation be realistic and deliverable? Is the plan unsound as a result of the site's non-allocation?***

3.8 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3 (pp. 131 – 135)

- ***Should LE99.2 the Monmouthshire – Brecon Canal be protected as informal leisure open space under LE5? Is the plan unsound as a result of the site’s non-allocation for this purpose? Should the proposed allocation replace the canal’s designation as a SINC under policy NH3?***

3.9 The Inspector’s attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB56:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultation – Committee Report (para. 23)
- **SB58:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultation – Volume 2 (pp. 36 – 40)
- **SB83:** Deposit LDP up to 2021 – Comprehensive List of Changes (including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) (pp. 128 – 129)
- ***Is the plan unsound as a result of the non-allocation of LE99.1 land rear of Woodville Terrace Argoed under policy LE4 for the purpose of allotment use? Would the allocation be appropriate, realistic and deliverable?***

3.10 The Inspector’s attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB58:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultation – Volume 2 (pp. 127 - 130)
- ***Does the non-identification of land at LE99.12 Brooklands, Risca for leisure/ as a play area under policy LE5 render the plan unsound?***

3.11 The Inspector’s attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 274 - 284).

4. **Tourism Allocations (TM1)**

- ***Is the plan unsound as a consequence of non-allocation of site TM99.1 Islwyn Scout Parc under policy TM1?***

4.1 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3 (pp. 291 - 294)

- ***Is the plan unsound as a consequence of non-allocation of TM99.4 land south of Westhaven, Watford Road, Caerphilly for tourism use under policy TM1?***

4.2 The Inspector's attention is directed to the following parts of the evidence base:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4 (pp. 274 - 284).