



Caerphilly County Borough  
Local Development Plan

Hearing Session 8: Employment & Commercial  
(Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> May 2010)

Examination 2010

**Caerphilly County Borough Council submission**

Examination Statement reference :

ES8.1

Submission date :

31 March 2010

## Hearing Session 8: Employment & Commercial

### 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.

## EMPLOYMENT MATTERS AND ISSUES

### 2. Policy CW15 Use Class Restrictions – Business and Industry

- ***Does part C of policy CW 15 need to be more flexible in relation to alternative uses on secondary industrial sites in order to make the Plan sound?***
- 2.1 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:
    - **SB61:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 5, CW15 Response, pages 239-241
  - ***Does the absence of a further limb to policy CW15, permitting wider redevelopment in certain circumstances of industrial estates not covered by parts A, B or C of the policy, render the Plan unsound?***
  - 2.2 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:
    - **SB61:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 5 CW15 Response, pages 239-241

### 3. Representations relating to employment sites ( Policies EM1, EM2)

- ***Is the protection of site EM2.11 North Celynen, Newbridge as a primary employment site unsound?***
- 3.1 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:
    - **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3, EM2.11 Response Pages 262-264

- 3.2 **SB37** Background Paper 7: Employment, sets out the amount of employment land required in the County Borough over the course of the plan period, based on a calculated estimated annual land requirement of 4.28 ha per annum. This leads to a 15-year requirement of 64.2 ha. The 101.9 ha allocated in the plan allows for a significant degree of flexibility, by providing just over 50% more than the annual land requirement.
- 3.3 Assuming that annual take-up matches, but does not exceed, the calculated annual requirement, the County Borough will have sufficient supply for approximately 24 years. It is therefore considered that the existing portfolio of sites allocated for employment use in the emerging LDP meets the County Borough's requirements, in terms of type, location and overall supply. Consequently, the non-allocation of additional sites would not render the plan unsound.
- ***Does the non-allocation of site D5 land at Ness Tar, Caerphilly for employment use under policy EM 1 render the plan unsound?***
- 3.4 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:
- **SB58:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 2, D05 Response, Page 373-382
- ***Does the non-allocation of site HG1.61/EM99.1 Waterloo Works for employment use under policy EM 1 render the plan unsound?***
- 3.5 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:
- **SB58:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 2, HG1.61 Response, Pages 3-6
- ***Does the non-allocation of site HG1.64/EM99.4 Bedwas Colliery site for employment use under policy EM 1 render the plan unsound?***
- 3.6 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:
- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, HG1.64 Response, Pages 41-78
- Note:** This matter is also to be discussed at Hearing Session 5 Bedwas Colliery.
- ***Does the non-allocation of site HG1.66/EM99.3 Venosa Trading Estate for employment use under policy EM 1 render the plan unsound?***
- 3.7 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:
- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, HG1.66 Response, Pages 164-167

- ***Does the non-allocation of site HG1.67/EM99.5 Pontypandy Industrial Estate for employment use under policy EM 1 render the plan unsound?***

3.8 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, HG1.67 Response, Pages **169-171**

- ***Does the non-allocation of site HG1.69/EM99.6 Cardiff Rd/Pentrebane St Caerphilly for employment use under policy EM 1 render the plan unsound?***

3.9 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, HG1.69 Response, Pages **347-348**

- ***Does the non-allocation of site HG1.62/EM99.2 former petrol filling station Trethomas for employment use under policy EM 1 render the plan unsound?***

3.10 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, HG1.62 Response, Pages **83-85**
- **LA46:** Update of Planning Consents December 2009 Allocation HG1.62 has outline planning consent for housing, which expires in March 2010. The site has also been granted planning permission for a Tesco Express in August 2009.

- ***Is the Plan unsound as a consequence of the non-allocation of site E310 land at Gelligaer Court Penpedairheol?***

3.11 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3, E310 Response, Pages **393-399**

- ***Is FC05 removal of allocation EM1.7 land south of Penyfan, Croespenmaen necessary in the interests of Plan soundness? Does the land perform the recognised function of a green wedge?***

3.12 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3, EM1.7 Response, Pages **80-83**
- **SB83:** Deposit LDP up to 2021 Comprehensive List of Changes (including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes), Focused Change 05, Pages **17&18**

- ***Is deletion of part of allocation EM2.10 land at north end of Penyfan industrial estate, Croespenmaen, and designation as open space as extension to LE 3.5 Penyfan Pond Country Park necessary in the interests of Plan soundness?***

3.13 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3, LE3.5 Response, Pages **94-96**
- ***Does the identification of site EM2.21 Switchgear, Pontllanfraith as a protected employment site subject to policy CW 15 make the Plan unsound? Is the identification of the site as suitable instead for a mixture of housing, retail and leisure development necessary in the interests of Plan soundness?***

3.14 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3, E90 Response, pages **360-364**
- **Have the employment allocations sought above been considered in respect of the Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA)? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require reassessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of this process?**

3.15 Proponents have not submitted SEA/SA assessments for sites D05, EM99.1, EM99.2, EM99.3, EM99.4, EM99.5 and EM99.6 to support / demonstrate the site's suitability as an employment allocation.

3.16 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows, in respect of SA/SEA assessment of EM2.10:

- **SB83:** Deposit LDP up to 2021 Comprehensive List of Changes (including Focused Changes and Additional Focused Changes) **Pages 17&18**

## COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT MATTERS AND ISSUES

### 4. Representations concerning commercial allocations and designations ( policies CM1 to CM5)

- ***Does the designation of site CM 2.1 Blackwood Gate as a Retail Warehouse Park under policy CM 2 and its exclusion from the Blackwood Principal Town Centre Boundary under policy CM 1.2 render the plan unsound?***

4.1 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB59:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 3, CM2.1 Response, Pages **15-21**. The response contained within this document makes reference to a 'undetermined appeal' for a foodstore on site CM1.2, this Appeal has now been resolved, with the Inspector finding in a favour of the Council, dismissing the appeal for a foodstore on site CM1.2 (Appeal Ref: APP/K6920/A/08/2093259/WF)

- ***Does the inclusion of site CM 4.9 Foundry site Risca/Pontymister as a principal town and key settlement development site render the Plan unsound?***

4.2 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, CM4.9 Response, Pages **244-257**
- **LA46:** Update of Planning Consents December 2009. Allocation CM4.9 has been granted full planning consent for a food superstore subject to a S.106 agreement being signed.

- ***Is the allocation of site CM99.2 at Pontymister Industrial Estate for commercial/retail development required in order to make the Plan sound?***

4.3 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, CM99.2 Response, Pages **259-263**

- ***Does the non-allocation of site HG1.62/CM99.3 former petrol filling station Trethomas for retail purposes under policy CM 4 render the plan unsound?***

4.4 The Inspector's attention is directed to the Evidence Base as follows:

- **SB60:** Council Report on Deposit and Alternative Sites Consultations – Volume 4, CM99.3 Response, Pages 83-85

- **LA46:** Update of Planning Consents December 2009. Allocation HG1.62 has outline planning consent for housing which expires in March 2010, in addition the site has also been granted planning permission for a Tesco Express in August 2009.
  - ***Have the changes sought above been considered in respect of the Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SEA/SA)? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require reassessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of this process?***
- 4.5 Proponents have not submitted SEA/SA assessments in respect of these representations.