



Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan

Background Assessment of Sites

October 2008

(Amended February 2010)

Introduction

The purpose of this Paper is to provide additional clarification on the evidence base supporting the allocation of sites for housing in the Deposit Local Development Plan. The candidate site assessment process is set out within Background Paper 14: Site Assessment Methodology (**SB45**) and candidate sites have been subject to a robust assessment to determine their suitability to be allocated in the plan. Consideration has also been given to sites upon which planning applications have been approved where a robust assessment on the suitability of sites for development has been undertaken as part of the determination of a planning application.

Detailed assessment work determining why certain sites were suitable for allocation was undertaken at the time of plan preparation but this is not included in detail within the published Background Paper 14 due to the volume of information it includes. This Paper provides more detail in four Appendices on the assessment of sites against the strategy and provides an indication in terms of why the allocated sites have been chosen compared to other sites that have been considered for inclusion in the plan.

Appendix 1 – Summary of the Strategy Assessment of Candidate Sites in Volume 6 of the Candidate Sites Register

Sites submitted as candidate sites were subject to a rigorous assessment as explained in detail within Background Paper 14. A summary of the first stages of the site assessment comprising the initial assessment of the site, an expert assessment in terms of countryside and landscape, highways and environmental health and consideration by a planning assessment time is included on a site by site basis in the Candidate Sites Register (Volumes 1-5, **SB85-SB89**). The Candidate Sites Register includes an initial assessment against the alternative strategies identified in Section 5 of the Preferred Strategy Appendices (**SB08**) as well as an assessment against the eight components of the Preferred Strategy on those sites that were found to be suitable for further consideration based on the initial and expert assessments.

Due to the number of candidate sites submitted to the Council for consideration, it was deemed appropriate to provide a summary of the outcome of the assessments of sites against the alternative strategies and component parts of the Preferred Strategy to allow comparisons between sites to be made more easily. This summary was included within Appendix 10 of the Preferred Strategy Appendices (**SB08**). However, this summary related only to sites that featured in the first five Volumes of the Candidate Sites Register i.e. sites that had been submitted prior to 22nd December 2006, which had been assessed in time for the consultation on the Preferred Strategy.

In May 2007 it was resolved that in order to ensure sufficient time was available to adequately assess sites for inclusion within the Deposit LDP it was necessary to impose a deadline of 30th May 2007 as the last date for the submission of candidate sites. The results of the assessment of the 35 additional sites submitted between 22nd December 2006 and 30th May 2007 were included in a sixth Volume of the Candidate Sites Register (**SB90**). As Volume 6 was published at a later date, it did not include the summary of the site assessments against the strategy, although the assessment is included on a site-by-site basis in the Candidate Site Register itself.

To allow for the easy comparison of the sites identified in Volume 6 of the Register, it is considered appropriate to display this assessment information in the same format previously used in Appendix 10 of the Preferred Strategy. This assessment includes

the sites that were deemed suitable for further consideration based on the expert assessments as well as those sites that were not identified as suitable, and a list of sites which were below the site size threshold of 0.33 hectares.

Appendix 2 – Assessment of Sites with planning consent as identified in the 1st April 2007 Joint Housing Land Availability Study

As set out in Background Paper 6: Population and Housing (**SB33**), sites with planning consent for 10 or more dwellings make a significant contribution to the housing requirement figures. Where sites with planning consent exist within settlements, these can make a vital contribution in supporting the role and function of settlements, especially as the principle of development has been established and such sites are realistically likely to be developed within the plan period. It should be noted that the JHLAS sites were not subject to the same initial and expert criteria as candidate sites as the suitability of these sites for development had already been determined in consultation with the relevant consultees as part of the development control process.

In towns and villages that have large sites with current planning consents, these have generally been taken forward as allocations where the sites also accord with the strategy and the consents are realistically likely to be implemented. It was considered appropriate to take these sites forward as allocations to provide certainty to developers on the location of new development. During a plan period, it is often common for the planning status of sites to change as planning consents lapse or sites without planning consent are granted permission. Whilst it is realistic to assume that sites with consent will be developed, if consents are not implemented the allocation of sites under Policy HG1 of the Deposit LDP will ensure that the principle of housing will remain and will ensure that sites are not lost to other land uses. This will allow for a more balanced approach to growth by providing a better indication of the location of residential development.

An assessment of all sites identified in the JHLAS site schedule for the 1st April 2007 study, which was the last published study at the time of plan preparation, was undertaken but to date was not included as part of the published evidence base. In order to demonstrate that there is robust evidence on the conformity of sites with planning consent with the strategy, a summary of the assessment of sites with planning consent against the alternative strategies and preferred strategy has been provided. Appendix 2 details this assessment. It should be noted that the Appendix only considers those sites that were not candidate sites (with the exception of two sites that have been reassessed) as the Candidate Site assessment against the strategy is available in the Preferred Strategy Appendices.

It will be noted from the assessment that not all sites with planning consent have been allocated in the plan on the grounds that they scored poorly when assessed against the strategy. In addition, in some cases new information was available which meant that the site would no longer be suitable for development or a change in the indicative capacity on the site meant that the site fell below the site size threshold of accommodating 10 dwellings.

Appendix 3 – Sites subject to planning application and sites that form part of regeneration initiatives

In addition to those sites that had planning consent as of the 1st April 2007, there were a small number of other significant sites that represented realistic development opportunities by virtue of the fact that planning applications had been submitted on

them, but had not been approved at the time of plan preparation, and/or that they had been identified as a component of a wider regeneration scheme.

These sites were not submitted as candidate sites but it was considered appropriate to assess them as possible allocations where the principle of development had been established through the development control process. In order to ensure that growth is balanced in accordance with the strategy it is important to take into account these known future developments, as they are realistically likely to come forward given that the submission of a planning application demonstrates developer interest. It should be noted that all sites, with the exception of Bargoed Retail Plateau, now have consent for housing (in three cases subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement). Appendix 3 summarises the assessment of these sites against the strategy.

Appendix 4 - Suitability of Sites for Allocation

As identified in Background Paper 14, sites that were deemed suitable for further consideration for a residential use in the Candidate Sites Register and Appendix 10 of the Preferred Strategy were subject to further assessment including consultation with statutory undertakers, services providers such as the education division and the Council's land drainage section. Consideration was also given to whether a site had planning consent and the level of constraint identified.

Where sites were deemed suitable at Preferred Strategy stage as identified in the Provisional Candidate Sites Register, but were not taken forward as allocations, the reasons for this were explained in Appendix 3 of Background Paper 14. The reasons associated with the decision not to allocate some sites for housing were varied, but included the availability of sites that better conformed to the plan strategy in the area and new information indicating that sites were no longer considered to be realistic or suitable due to the level of constraints.

Where sites were taken forward as allocations in the LDP, this was identified in Appendix 3 of BP14. However, the robust reasons for site allocation were not published within this Background Paper due to the volume of information, although this work did form part of the evidence base.

Appendix 4 has been produced, in order to ensure that the reasons for site allocation are transparent. This Appendix sets out an explanation as to how those sites taken forward as allocations meet the strategy as well as identifying how the sites compare to other sites that have been identified in the area. This information should be viewed alongside Volumes 2 to 4 of the Council Consideration of Representations (**SB58-SB60**) where representations have been submitted in respect of specific allocated housing sites as this provides further information on the suitability of sites for development in the context of representations received.

Appendix 4 also provides the reasons why sites were not allocated, which has been taken directly from Appendix 3 of BP14. In the interests of consistency with the approach undertaken in the candidate sites register, sites included in Appendix 4 have been listed in alphabetical order by ward to allow the comparison of sites within the same geographical area.

It should be noted that the evidence identified in Appendix 4 was based upon the assessment undertaken as part of the plan preparation process (early 2008). It is noted that information in respect of planning consents has now changed. However, an update of planning consents is provided elsewhere and it is not considered

necessary to repeat the up to date position within Appendix 4, which reflected the position at the time of plan preparation. Where sites have now been recommended for removal this has however been identified within the text.

It is also necessary to recognise that, due to the time when this work was undertaken, where comparisons have been made with other sites, these were sites submitted through the candidate sites process as detailed in Volumes 1 to 6 of the Candidate Sites Register and not 'Alternative Sites' submitted during the Deposit consultation. The assessment of the suitability of these 'Alternative' sites is considered as part of the Council Consideration of Representations report (Volumes 2 to 4) (**SB58-SB60**).

Appendix 1

Candidate Sites Summary of Provisional Site Assessments (sites submitted between December 2006 and May 2007) Volume 6 of Candidate Sites Register Sites For Further Consideration					Conformity With Strategy					Conformity With Preferred Strategy Factors								
Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Ward	Planning Preferred Use	Small Site	Not Assessed	UDP Strategy	Urban Containment	Sustainable Growth	Preferred Strategy	Opportunities North	Balanced Future	Exploit Brownfield	Resource Efficient	Provide Infrastructure	Provide Community Facilities	Limit Countryside Impact	Settlement Function
D160	Cwm Ifor Primary	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	School/Leisure/Housing		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
D163	Hendre County Infants School	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
E393	Former depot south of Pontlottyn Link Road	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D165	Greenhill Primary School	Gelligaer	St Cattwg	School/Leisure/Housing			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
D162	St James Primary, Lansbury Park	Caerphilly	St James	School/Leisure/Housing			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

Appendix 1

Candidate Sites Summary of Provisional Site Assessments (sites submitted between December 2006 and May 2007) Volume 6 of Candidate Sites Register Sites Ruled Out For Further Consideration					Conformity With Strategy					Conformity With Preferred Strategy Factors								
Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Ward	Planning Preferred Use	Small Site	Not Assessed	UDP Strategy	Urban Containment	Sustainable Growth	Preferred Strategy	Opportunities North	Balanced Future	Exploit Brownfield	Resource Efficient	Provide Infrastructure	Provide Community Facilities	Limit Countryside Impact	Settlement Function
E413	Land to the rear of St Annes Gardens	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E398	Land south of Upper Francis Street	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E399	Land south of Upper Francis Street including quarry	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E414	Land at the end of Chapel Street	Abercarn	Abercarn	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E415	Land south of Sheedy's scrap yard	Cwmcarn	Abercarn	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E410	Land adjoining the Rhos, Railway Terrace	Hollybush	Argoed	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E409	Former School Garage	Hollybush	Argoed	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E396	Land north of Factory Road	Bargoed	Bargoed	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E405	Land adjacent to High Street	Blackwood	Blackwood	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E416	Land at Aberbeeg Bridge	Aberbeeg	Crumlin	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E418	Land west of Abertillery Hospital	Aberbeeg	Crumlin	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													

Appendix 1

Candidate Sites Summary of Provisional Site Assessments (sites submitted between December 2006 and May 2007) Volume 6 of Candidate Sites Register Sites Ruled Out For Further Consideration					Conformity With Strategy					Conformity With Preferred Strategy Factors								
Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Ward	Planning Preferred Use	Small Site	Not Assessed	UDP Strategy	Urban Containment	Sustainable Growth	Preferred Strategy	Opportunities North	Balanced Future	Exploit Brownfield	Resource Efficient	Provide Infrastructure	Provide Community Facilities	Limit Countryside Impact	Settlement Function
E419	Land east of Abertillery Hospital	Aberbeeg	Crumlin	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E406	Land off Cheriton Avenue	Cefn Hengoed	Hengoed	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E411	Land east of The Rise	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E391	Land to the south of Holly House Nursing Home	Fleur de Lys	Maesycwmmmer	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E404	Land south of Twyn Gwyn Farm	Newbridge	Newbridge	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E402	Land North of Edwards Terrace	Newbridge	Newbridge	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E407	Land adjoining Heathfield	Gellihaf	Pengam	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E389	Land to the west of Hendredenny	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E412	Land north of Bryn Nant	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E401	Land at Crossroads Yard	Pengam	St Cattwg	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E400	Land north of Van Road	Caerphilly	St James	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E397	Former Tar Plant and Land to the South	Caerphilly	St Martins	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													
E403	Land south of Pencoedcae Farm	Princetown	Twyn Carno	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>													

Appendix 1

Candidate Sites Summary of Provisional Site Assessments (sites submitted between December 2006 and May 2007) Volume 6 of Candidate Sites Register

Small Sites

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Ward	Planning Preferred Use	Conformity With Strategy					Conformity With Preferred Strategy Factors							
					Small Site	Not Assessed	UDP Strategy	Urban Containment	Sustainable Growth	Preferred Strategy	Opportunities North	Balanced Future	Exploit Brownfield	Resource Efficient	Provide Infrastructure	Provide Community Facilities	Limit Countryside Impact
E392	Land to the rear of Cilgerran Way	Blackwood	Blackwood	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
E417	Site of former public hall	Aberbeeg	Crumlin	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
E394	Land at Prince Cottages	Fleur de Lys	Maesycwmmmer	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
E408	Land opposite Cartref Newydd, Edwards Terrace	Newbridge	Newbridge	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
E390	Land at Barn House	Pengam	Pengam	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
E395	Land to the south of Greenmeadow House	Risca	Risca West	None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											

Appendix 2

Assessment of sites with planning consent as identified in JHLAS 1st April 2007 (Sites not considered through candidate sites process)					Conformity With Strategy					Conformity With Preferred Strategy Factors								
Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Ward	Consented Use	Small Site	Not Assessed	UDP Strategy	Urban Containment	Sustainable Growth	Preferred Strategy	Opportunities North	Balanced Future	Exploit Brownfield	Resource Efficient	Provide Infrastructure	Provide Community Facilities	Limit Countryside Impact	Settlement Function
1457	Land below Coronation Terrace	Senghenydd	Aber Valley	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
721	Land west of the A467 and Afon Ebbw	Abercarn	Abercarn	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
1335	Former Petrol Filling Station, Newport Rd	Trethomas	Bedwas, TM	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
1266	Land north of Glanyafon +	Fleur de Lys	Pengam	Residential		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												
1382	The Stores, Albertina Road	Newbridge	Crumlin	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
761	Land within curtilage of The Pentwyn Inn	Trinant	Crumlin	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
1373	Alexander House, Colliery Road	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Residential				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
1163	Maerdy Garage adj to Maerdy House	Rhymney	Moriah	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1158	Former Cattle Market Site	Nelson	Nelson	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
1105/A19	Pennar Lane*	Newbridge	Newbridge	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1554	Chris Bowen Garage	Newbridge	Newbridge	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
1261	Castlegate	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Mixed Use			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
561	Old Junction House ^	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Residential		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												

Appendix 2

Assessment of sites with planning consent as identified in JHLAS 1st April 2007 (Sites not considered through candidate sites process)					Conformity With Strategy					Conformity With Preferred Strategy Factors								
Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Ward	Consented Use	Small Site	Not Assessed	UDP Strategy	Urban Containment	Sustainable Growth	Preferred Strategy	Opportunities North	Balanced Future	Exploit Brownfield	Resource Efficient	Provide Infrastructure	Provide Community Facilities	Limit Countryside Impact	Settlement Function
1162	Heol Evan Wynne	Pontlloctyn	Pontlloctyn	Residential		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
1412	Rom River	Risca	Risca East	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
1152	106/106A and Car Park, Commercial St +	Risca	Risca East	Residential		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												
1124	Land at Station Approach, Risca	Risca	Risca West	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
1492	Land at the Quarry, Moriah Hill ^	Risca	Risca West	Residential		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>												
488	Land north east of Llanarth Street	Wattsville	Ynysddu	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
294/ A14	Penallta Colliery*	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Residential			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

+ Sites not taken forward as both lie within Zone C2 and, in the interests of following the precautionary principle of avoiding development in the flood plain, the allocation of these site was considered inappropriate.

* Sites were considered through the candidate sites process but were not taken identified as being suitable for further consideration as they had valid planning consents and were under construction. It was considered that they were likely to be completed during the plan preparation process and therefore it would not be necessary to allocate the sites. However, given the size of the sites and the fact that development is to take part in phases, it was considered that the rate of development is likely to be at a slower rate than originally anticipated, particularly on the Penallta Colliery site. It was therefore necessary to summarise the assessment against the component parts of the strategy as the sites were originally ruled out before this stage.

^ Sites were not taken forward as further assessment as further investigation of the sites indicated that the likely capacity that could be accommodated on the site was below 10 dwellings, which was the threshold defined in the allocation of sites.

Appendix 3

Assessment of sites subject to planning applications and regeneration initiatives (Sites not considered through candidate sites process)					Conformity With Strategy					Conformity With Preferred Strategy Factors								
Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Ward	Identified Use	Small Site	Not Assessed	UDP Strategy	Urban Containment	Sustainable Growth	Preferred Strategy	Opportunities North	Balanced Future	Exploit Brownfield	Resource Efficient	Provide Infrastructure	Provide Community Facilities	Limit Countryside Impact	Settlement Function
D157	Cardiff Road/Pentrebane Street	Caerphilly	St Martins	Mixed use			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D158	Eastern part of land adjacent to River Ebbw	Risca	Risca West	Mixed use			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D159	Suflex Factory	Risca	Risca West	Housing			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D169	Venosa Trading Estate	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	Housing			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D171	South of Thorncombe Road	Blackwood	Blackwood	Housing			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
D172	Bargoed Retail Plateau	Bargoed	Bargoed	Mixed Use			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Appendix 4

Suitability of Sites for Allocation

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
A16	<p>Windsor Colliery</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the Candidate Sites Register (CSR) indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Abertridwr and the contiguous settlement of Senghenydd, which are both identified as residential areas. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. Whilst it is recognised that the site is large, with a capacity of 193 units, its location between the settlements of Abertridwr and Senghenydd means that the site serves both communities in an area that has had little new housing in recent years. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it maximises the use of brownfield land in the SCC, which is an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former colliery. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and relates well to the existing development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. ▪ The site adjoins a SINC and concern has been raised as part of the consultation process 	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	HG1.77

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>regarding the potential impact of development on this SINC. However, it is considered that the countryside impact is likely to be minimal as any adverse impacts could be mitigated.</p> <p>Windsor Colliery is brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 19 candidate sites were submitted in the Aber Valley, although 6 of these were below the site size threshold. Only 5 candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration, alongside one other site with the benefit of planning consent. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR. Further assessment of the suitable sites has indicated that only this site, E188 and 1457 represent realistic propositions for development. There are no other development opportunities of the scale of Windsor Colliery in the Aber Valley. Given the desire for new development in the Aber Valley in line with its role and function, Windsor Colliery represents the best site for major housing development.</p>			
B10	<p>Coed y Pica</p> <p>The topography of the site means that it has a capacity of less than 10 dwellings and therefore falls below the threshold for inclusion as a housing site within the Deposit LDP. The site was granted consent in 2006 for 5 dwellings (P/05/1664). It was not therefore considered to be appropriate to allocate but has been left within settlement limits.</p>	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	Not allocated
D88	<p>Ysgol Ifor Bach</p> <p>More detailed examinations have indicated significant access problems. In light of this it was deemed more appropriate to leave unallocated within settlement limits to allow it to come forward as a brownfield redevelopment should access issues be resolved within the plan period.</p>	Senghenydd	Aber Valley	Not allocated
E188	<p>Land east of Coedcae Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	HG1.76

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. In order to form a rational boundary for the site, additional land that has also been submitted through the candidate site process has been incorporated.</p> <p>Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Abertridwr, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. It is recognised that there is another site allocated in Abertridwr (Windsor Colliery), but land east of Coedcae Road is much smaller in scale and will help diversify the house stock in the southern part of Abertridwr, which has experienced very little new housing development in recent years. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it maximises the use of brownfield land in the SCC, which is an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities, as a major part of the site is currently being used for the storage of materials. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it represents a logical extension to the settlement of Abertridwr ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ Whilst trees and hedgerows bordering the site are identified as constraints to development, this has been recognised in Appendix 7 of the LDP where it is identified that mature trees should be retained as part of any development and a site development brief will be produced to address these constraints. As such, it is considered that impact on the countryside would be limited. 			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Land east of Coedcae Road is primarily brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 19 candidate sites were submitted in the Aber Valley, although 6 of these were below the site size threshold. Only 5 candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration, alongside one other site with the benefit of planning consent. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR. Further assessment of the suitable sites has indicated that only this site, A16 and 1457 represent realistic propositions for development. Coedcae Road is the only suitable site in the southern part of Abertridwr and its allocation would help to diversify the housing stock in this part of the settlement.</p>			
F8	<p>Land West of Four Terraces</p> <p>The highways department have indicated that there are major constraints in accessing the site, as the width of the road is substandard. It is however noted that the site offers one of only a few opportunities for new housing development in the Aber Valley so it has been considered appropriate not to allocate but to leave within settlement limits as an acceptable rounding off of the settlement of Senghenydd.</p>	Senghenydd	Aber Valley	Not allocated
1457	<p>Land below Coronation Terrace</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p>	Senghenydd	Aber Valley	HG1.78

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Senghenydd, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. It is recognised that there is major site allocated in the contiguous settlement of Abertridwr (Windsor Colliery), but the Coronation Terrace site is much smaller in scale and will help diversify the housing stock in the northern part of Senghenydd, which has experienced very little new housing development in recent years. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would represent an efficient use of land within the SCC, which is an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to existing development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. ▪ As the site is greenfield, it would not exploit brownfield opportunities. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 19 candidate sites were submitted in the Aber Valley, although 6 of these were below the site size threshold. Only 5 candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration, alongside one other site with the benefit of planning consent. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR. Further assessment of the suitable sites has indicated that only this site, E188 and A16 represent realistic propositions for development. This site at Coronation Terrace is the only suitable site in the northern part of Senghenydd and its allocation would help to diversify the housing stock in this part of the settlement.</p>			
A07	Bedwellty Road	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	HG1.16

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP along with D46.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. The boundary of the site has been amended to incorporate additional land to the north (candidate site D46) as this would form a logical boundary based on the proposed alignment of the Aberbargoed to Bedwellty Relief Road and would reflect the boundary of P/06/0671, which was awaiting determination as of the base date 1st April 2007.</p> <p>Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Aberbargoed, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. It is recognised that the site is capable of accommodating a significant number of dwellings but it is important that Aberbargoed is considered as part of the wider functional area of Greater Bargoed. Bargoed (the Principal Town in the HoV) and Aberbargoed will have excellent links as a result of the development of the Angel Way. In this wider context, the level of development is considered to be appropriate, particularly when it is considered that Greater Bargoed has experienced very little growth in the past ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructure investment taking place within the Greater Bargoed area ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it represents a logical rounding off given the route of the proposed Relief Road. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. 			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Whilst the site is greenfield, consultation with the Countryside and Landscape section have indicated that it is not a sensitive area of countryside in landscape or nature conservation terms. The impact on the countryside would therefore be minimal. <p>The site does not conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield. <p>Although greenfield, the Bedwellty Road site is suitable for development and conforms to the strategy. It is therefore an appropriate development opportunity. Furthermore, this site was subject to a planning application for housing, which was awaiting determination as of the base date of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 17 candidate sites were submitted in the Aberbargoed ward, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. A total of 9 candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>There are a number of sites deemed suitable for further consideration in Aberbargoed, although, in the interests of ensuring balanced development across the County Borough in a sustainable manner which reflects the role and function of individual settlements it is not considered appropriate to allocate all sites in the settlement. In determining which sites were to go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to how well sites conform to the strategy and how realistic the allocations are. Bedwellty Road accords with a greater number of component parts than some other sites in Aberbargoed. Furthermore, it is considered to be realistic given that an application for housing has been submitted on the site and there is developer interest.</p>			
A25	<p>Aberbargoed Plateau</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that</p>	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	HG1.19

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Aberbargoed, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. It is recognised that this site, along with other allocations in Aberbargoed is capable of accommodating a significant number of dwellings but it is important that Aberbargoed is considered as part of the wider functional area of Greater Bargoed. due to the excellent links between Bargoed (a Principal Town) and Aberbargoed as a result of the opening of the Angel Way bypass. Bargoed (the Principal Town in the HoV) and Aberbargoed will have excellent links as a result of the development of the Angel Way. In this wider context, the level of development is considered to be appropriate, particularly when it is considered that Greater Bargoed has experienced very little growth in the past ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the Greater Bargoed area ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to the existing settlement. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ As a former colliery site, which has been reclaimed, the allocation of the site would exploit a significant brownfield opportunity. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on the countryside. Priority species have been identified in the vicinity of the site, although the need for a full ecological survey to be undertaken as part of any planning application is identified in Appendix 8. In this context care will need to be taken to ensure that 			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>development will not adversely impact on that area which is important in terms of nature conservation.</p> <p>Aberbargoed Plateau is brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 17 candidate sites were submitted in the Aberbargoed ward, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. A total of 9 candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>There are a number of sites deemed suitable for further consideration in Aberbargoed, although, in the interests of ensuring balanced development across the County Borough in a sustainable manner which reflects the role and function of individual settlements it is not considered appropriate to allocate all sites in the settlement. In determining which sites were to go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to how well sites conform to the strategy and how realistic the allocations are. Aberbargoed Plateau accords with a greater number of component parts than some other sites in Aberbargoed and the site is therefore considered to be an appropriate allocation. Whilst no planning applications for housing have been submitted on the land, the construction of the Angel Way, which will provide access into the site will make the site an attractive and realistic option for development.</p>			
D46	<p>Land North of Bedwellty Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP along with A07.</p>	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	See HG1.16
D47	<p>Land at Aberbargoed Tip</p> <p>Part of the site is required for the Bedwellty Road Relief Road, although further discussions with Highways have indicated that it would not be possible for an access to be provided into the remainder of the site from the bypass and therefore it is not deemed appropriate for the site to be included with the Deposit LDP.</p>	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Not Assessed

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
D53	<p>Bedwellty Comprehensive School</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The boundary has been amended to accommodate only the housing component and is therefore no longer considered as a mixed-use proposal. The leisure element is allocated as a formal leisure facility.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Aberbargoed, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. It is recognised that this site, along with other allocations in Aberbargoed is capable of accommodating a significant number of dwellings but it is important that Aberbargoed is considered as part of the wider functional area of Greater Bargoed. Bargoed (the Principal Town in the HoV) and Aberbargoed will have excellent links as a result of the development of the Angel Way. In this wider context, the level of development is considered to be appropriate, particularly when it is considered that Greater Bargoed has experienced very little growth in the past. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the Greater Bargoed area ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to the existing settlement. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities 	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	HG1.23

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>through appropriate planning obligations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As a former school, which has now been demolished, the allocation of the site would exploit brownfield opportunities. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is the potential for impact on the countryside. This site is within close proximity to a Special Area of Conservation, although an appropriate assessment indicating the potential impact on this allocation on the SAC has been undertaken as part of HRA, where it was found that appropriate management procedures were in place. Appendix 8 of the LDP indicates that a further appropriate assessment should be carried out at planning application stage. <p>Bedwellty School is brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 17 candidate sites were submitted in the Aberbargoed ward, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. A total of 9 candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>There are a number of sites deemed suitable for further consideration in Aberbargoed. However in the interests of ensuring balanced development across the County Borough that reflects the role and function of individual settlements, it is not considered appropriate to allocate all sites in the settlement. In determining which sites were to go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to the how well sites conform to the strategy and how realistic the allocations are. Bedwellty School adheres with the Strategy more closely than some other sites in Aberbargoed and the site is therefore considered to be an appropriate allocation. Furthermore, the site has been cleared and represents an attractive development opportunity.</p>			
E138	<p>Bargoed Ambulance Station</p> <p>The site was not suitable for residential development due to its proximity to the Country Park and</p>	Bargoed	Aberbargoed	Not allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	therefore a tourism-based proposal was considered more acceptable. No specific proposals for such a use have been identified and therefore it is considered most appropriate to continue to leave the site outside of the settlement boundary. Proposals for future development will then be determined in accordance with appropriate LDP policies and national planning guidance.			
E142	<p>Aberbargoed and District Hospital</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Aberbargoed, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. It is recognised that this site, along with other allocations in Aberbargoed is capable of accommodating a significant number of dwellings but it is important that Aberbargoed is considered as part of the wider functional area of Greater Bargoed. Bargoed (the Principal Town in the HoV) and Aberbargoed will have excellent links as a result of the development of the Angel Way. In this wider context, the level of development is considered to be appropriate, particularly when it is considered that Greater Bargoed has experienced very little growth in the past. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the Greater Bargoed area ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits 	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	HG1.18

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>and is well related to the existing settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is not considered that the development will impact upon the countryside ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ As a hospital site, which is scheduled to close in 2011/12, the allocation of the site would exploit brownfield opportunities. <p>Aberbargoed and District Hospital is brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 17 candidate sites were submitted in the Aberbargoed ward, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. A total of 9 candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>There are a number of sites deemed suitable for further consideration in the Aberbargoed area, although, in the interests of ensuring balanced development across the County Borough which reflects the role and function of individual settlements it is not considered appropriate to allocate all sites in the Aberbargoed area. In determining which sites were to go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to the how well sites conform with the strategy and how realistic such allocations are. Aberbargoed and District Hospital accords with a greater number of component parts than some other sites in Aberbargoed and the site is therefore considered to be an appropriate allocation. In addition, the site will become surplus to requirement with the owners seeking to dispose of it in the early part of the plan period as a result of the new hospital opening in Ystrad Fawr.</p>			
E314	<p>Land at Coed y Brain House</p> <p>There are a number of sites deemed suitable for further consideration in the Aberbargoed area, although, in the interests of ensuring balanced development across the County Borough in a sustainable manner which reflects the role and function of individual settlements it is not considered appropriate to allocate all sites in the Aberbargoed area. In determining which sites were to go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to the how well sites conform with the strategy</p>	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Not allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>in addition to how realistic such allocations are.</p> <p>The site does not conform with three component parts of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is greenfield, therefore it is not exploiting brownfield opportunities • The site would represent a greenfield settlement extension and, taking into account the availability of brownfield sites in the area which better reflect the strategy, as well as sites with planning consent, it is not considered to be a balanced approach to future growth to allow additional sites to be released. • As a greenfield settlement extension, the site would not limit the impact on the countryside, particularly as the site has been identified as having ecological value. <p>In light of the availability of other sites to address the housing requirements of the area, it is considered most appropriate to leave these sites outside of the settlement boundary.</p>			
E348	<p>Land forming part of Coed-y-Brain Farm, Aberbargoed</p> <p>There are a number of sites deemed suitable for further consideration in the Aberbargoed area, although, in the interests of ensuring balanced development across the County Borough in a sustainable manner which reflects the role and function of individual settlements it is not considered appropriate to allocate all sites in the Aberbargoed area. In determining which sites were to go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to the how well sites conform with the strategy in addition to how realistic such allocations are.</p> <p>The site does not conform with three component parts of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is greenfield, therefore it is not exploiting brownfield opportunities • The site would represent a greenfield settlement extension and, taking into account the availability of brownfield sites in the area which better reflect the strategy, as well as sites with planning consent, it is not considered to be a balanced approach to future growth to allow additional sites to be released. • As a greenfield settlement extension, the site would not limit the impact on the countryside, particularly as the site has been identified as having ecological value. 	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Not allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	In light of the availability of other sites to address the housing requirements of the area, it is considered most appropriate to leave these sites outside of the settlement boundary.			
D28	<p>Land south of Chapel Farm Terrace</p> <p>The site is constrained by its location within a Zone C Flood Risk area where highly vulnerable development such as housing should be precluded. The Council has adopted a precautionary approach to the designation of land within flood risk areas and as such it is considered inappropriate to allocate the site for an alternative use.</p> <p>It is intended to leave the site within settlement limits to allow it to come forward for an alternative use provided it can be demonstrated that flood risk can be acceptably managed.</p>	Cwmcarn	Abercarn	Not allocated
721	<p>Land west of the A467 and Afon Ebbw</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent for housing, the first phase of which was under construction at the time of allocation.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was capable of delivery. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Abercarn, which is a residential area. The site is also in close proximity to the Key Settlement of Newbridge. The functional analysis makes specific reference to this site as a means of diversifying the housing stock. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would represent an efficient use of land within the SCC, which is an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns. The River Ebbw and the A467/A472 segregate the site from Newbridge and Abercarn, however development of this site would 	Abercarn	Abercarn	HG1.50

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>maximise the use of a significant brownfield development opportunity, therefore reducing the need to allocate more intrusive greenfield sites in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former colliery. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>This site represents an appropriate development opportunity on previously developed land in an area with few major development opportunities. The site conforms to the strategy and it is considered to be a realistic proposition for development given that the site has planning consent and the first phase is under construction.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 15 candidate sites were submitted in the Abercarn ward, although 3 of these were below the site size threshold. Only one candidate site (D28) in the ward was deemed suitable for further consideration at candidate site stage, although this has subsequently been discounted on flood risk grounds. D77 Twyncarn House was originally ruled out from further consideration on the grounds that highways work may result in the capacity of the site falling below the site size threshold. However, this has been reassessed as a housing application submitted on the site, demonstrating a capacity over the threshold of 10. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>As a site with planning consent and one of only two sites deemed suitable for further consideration in the whole ward, Land West of the Afon Ebbw represents one of the best and most realistic development opportunity in the Abercarn/Cwmcarn area. It is considered that the allocation of two sites is warranted to support the role and functions of these two communities. The site has therefore been taken forward as an allocation, alongside Twyncarn House.</p>			
D77	Twyncarn House	Cwmcarn	Abercarn	HG1.51

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicated that the site was suitable for development but was not given further consideration on the grounds that the capacity of the site was likely to fall below the allocation threshold of 10 dwellings due to the need for highways improvements. However, a planning application submitted on the site demonstrated that a greater number of units could be accommodated, therefore meaning that the site was worthy of further consideration. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment against the strategy indicated that the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Cwmcarn, which is a residential area. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would represent an efficient use of land within the SCC, which is an area with limited environmental capacity. It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is an infill site. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former Council day centre <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>This site represents an appropriate development opportunity on previously developed land in an area with few major development opportunities. The site conforms to the strategy and it is considered to be a realistic proposition for development given that a planning application for housing has been submitted on the site.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 15 candidate sites were submitted in the Abercarn ward, although 3 of these were below the site size threshold. The only suitable sites in the area are Twyncarn House and Land west of the A467 and River Ebbw, which is a site with planning consent rather than a candidate site. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>Overall, Abercarn/Cwmcarn area has experienced very little development in recent years as a result of its steep topography and therefore it is appropriate for the area to sustain more than one allocation as a means of diversifying the housing stock. It is therefore appropriate, given the development interest in the Twyncarn House, to allocate the land west of the A467 and Afon Ebbw.</p>			
A05	<p>Land adjacent to Abernant Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development, although ecological constraints have been identified. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Markham, which is a residential area. The functional analysis identifies that no major change is envisaged in this area and the allocation of this site would not represent a change given its status as a housing allocation in the UDP. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, whilst the site represents a greenfield 	Markham	Argoed	HG1.15

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>extension to Markham, it is well related to the existing settlement and would represent an appropriate rounding off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site does not conform with the following component parts of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is greenfield, therefore it is not exploiting brownfield opportunities ▪ Concerns have been raised regarding the ecological value due to the presence of neutral grassland on the site and therefore there is likely to be some impact on the countryside. The need for a full ecological survey to be undertaken at planning application stage is identified in Appendix 7 of the LDP. <p>Whilst it is recognised that the site is greenfield and there is likely to be some ecological impact of development, the benefits of this site in offering the only major development opportunity in Markham is significant. The site conforms to other elements of the strategy and the principle of residential development on the site has been established by its inclusion for housing within the UDP.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 40 candidate sites were submitted in the Argoed ward, of which 10 were in the vicinity of Markham. One site was below the site size threshold. Only two candidate site (E51 and this site) were deemed suitable for further consideration at candidate site stage. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given the size of Markham and the reference in the strategy that no major change is envisaged in this area, it is considered that the allocation of only one housing site would be appropriate. If a comparison is made between A05 and E51, A05 Abernant Road represents a more appropriate development opportunity on the grounds that it would represent a natural extension to the settlement of Markham. Conversely E51 would be an illogical extension unless a significant area of land designated as a SINC was brought into the boundary. Given that Abernant Road better conforms with the strategy, it has been taken forward as an allocation rather than site E51.</p>			
E13	Land immediately adjacent to Gelynos Avenue	Argoed	Argoed	HG1.17

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has the benefit of outline planning consent for 13 dwellings and full applications have been approved on several of the plots on the site as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Argoed, which is a residential area. The plan strategy identifies that no major change is envisaged in this area and the allocation of this site would not represent a change given that the site was already located within the defined settlement boundary in the UDP. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is well related to the existing settlement and would represent a natural extension. ▪ It is not considered that the development will impact upon the countryside ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site does not conform with the following component parts of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is greenfield, therefore it is not exploiting brownfield opportunities <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 40 candidate sites were submitted in the Argoed ward, of which 17 were in the vicinity of</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Argoed. Three of these sites were below the site size threshold. E13 Gelynos Avenue was the only site deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>Gelynos Avenue already has the benefit of planning consent, indicating that it is a realistic proposition for development. The prospect of the site for development is reinforced by the fact that the land directly west of the site has been developed for a similar type of development. The site is also in conformity with the strategy. It is therefore considered that Gelynos Avenue is an appropriate allocation.</p>			
E51	<p>Land at the rear of James St</p> <p>Whilst the site itself is acceptable in ecology terms, it would not be regarded as a natural extension to the settlement unless the boundary was rationalised. The site boundary would also need to be amended to ensure adequate access can be provided. However, it would not be possible to create a more rational boundary as the site adjoins a SINC and the release of additional land would be detrimental to the important ecological value of the area.</p> <p>In addition, given the role and function of Markham where little change is envisaged, the allocation of a second greenfield site in addition to the site at Abernant Road, which is currently allocated in the UDP, would not be considered to be a balanced approach to future growth.</p>	Markham	Argoed	Not allocated
A08/B12	<p>Gilfach Fargoed (Phases 1 and 2) – identified in the LDP as Park Estate</p> <p>The two contiguous sites (A08 and B12) have been taken forward as one housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	Gilfach	Bargoed	HG1.22

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Bargoed, which is a Principal Town, where additional residential development would be welcomed as a means of diversifying the housing stock ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, whilst the site is greenfield, it lies within existing settlement limits ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site will not have a detrimental impact upon the countryside. <p>The site does not conform to the following component parts of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is greenfield, therefore it is not exploiting brownfield opportunities <p>The Park Estate site is suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, only 6 candidate sites were submitted in Bargoed and the contiguous ward of Gilfach. The Gilfach Fargoed site and D73 YGG Cwm Rhymini were the only sites deemed suitable for further consideration, in addition to the housing element of the Bargoed Retail Plateau development (D172), which was not submitted through the candidate site process. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>All three sites conform well to the strategy and are considered to be realistic propositions for development. It is recognised that residential development opportunities within the Principal Town of Bargoed itself are limited given the nature of the existing development and topographical constraints.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>However, it is important to consider Bargoed within the wider context of Greater Bargoed and there are a number of residential development opportunities supporting the role and function of the town within the adjoining settlement of Aberbargoed, which will have excellent links to the town resulting from the opening of the Angel Way.</p>			
D73	<p>YGG Cwm Rhymni</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. As of 1st April 2007, the site had the benefit of planning consent for a 100% affordable housing development.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable. The site would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Bargoed, which is a Principal Town, where additional residential development would be welcomed as a means of diversifying the housing stock ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will exploit a brownfield opportunities as the site was a former school. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site will not have a detrimental impact upon the countryside. <p>The former YGG Cwm Rhymni site is suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity. Furthermore, it represented a realistic</p>	Bargoed	Bargoed	HG1.21

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>development opportunity at the time of allocation as it had a valid consent for housing.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, only 6 candidate sites were submitted in Bargoed and the contiguous ward of Gilfach. Gilfach Fargoed site and D73 YGG Cwm Rhymni were the only sites deemed suitable for further consideration, in addition to the housing element of the Bargoed Retail Plateau development (D172), which was not submitted through the candidate site process. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>All three sites conform well to the strategy and are considered to be realistic propositions for development. It is recognised that residential development opportunities within the Principal Town of Bargoed itself are limited given the nature of the existing development and topographical constraints. However, it is important to consider Bargoed within the wider context of Greater Bargoed and there are a number of residential development opportunities supporting the role and function of the town within the adjoining settlement of Aberbargoed, which will have excellent links to the town resulting from the opening of the Angel Way bypass.</p>			
D172	<p>Bargoed Retail Plateau</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted through the candidate sites process but does form part of the Council's regeneration strategy for Bargoed where an element of housing is envisaged alongside the proposed superstore development (CM 4.2). The creation of a retail plateau in Bargoed has planning consent and is under construction, although no applications have been submitted for the superstore or housing element.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Bargoed, which is a Principal Town, where additional residential development would be welcomed as a 	Bargoed	Bargoed	HG1.20

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>means of diversifying the housing stock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will exploit a brownfield opportunities as the site was part of Bargoed colliery. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, although the creation of the retail plateau is essentially an extension of Bargoed, it is well related to the existing town centre. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site will not have a detrimental impact upon the countryside. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, only 6 candidate sites were submitted in Bargoed and the contiguous ward of Gilfach. Gilfach Fargoed site and D73 YGG Cwm Rhymini were the only sites deemed suitable for further consideration, in addition to the housing element of the Bargoed Retail Plateau development (D172), which was not submitted through the candidate site process. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>All three sites conform well to the strategy and are considered to be realistic propositions for development. It is recognised that residential development opportunities within the Principal Town of Bargoed itself are limited given the nature of the existing development and topographical constraints. However, it is important to consider Bargoed within the wider context of Greater Bargoed and there are a number of residential development opportunities supporting the role and function of the town within the adjoining settlement of Aberbargoed, which will have excellent links to the town resulting from the opening of the Angel Way bypass.</p>			
1335	<p>Former Petrol Filling Station, Newport Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had full consent for 10 dwellings as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007,</p>	Trethomas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	HG1.62

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Trethomas, which is identified as a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. Whilst it is recognised that the Bedwas Colliery site is in close proximity, the Colliery site is likely to come forward in the latter part of the plan period, whereas the former petrol filling station, which has a valid planning consent is likely to come forward earlier. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it maximises the use of land within settlement limits in an area with limited environmental capacity. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It would not have any impact upon the countryside. ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former petrol station. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>This former petrol station site is considered to be an appropriate allocation as it is a brownfield site, which is well related to the existing settlement of Trethomas and conforms to the LDP strategy. Furthermore, as the site has previously received planning consent for housing, it is considered to be a realistic proposition for development.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the Bedwas, Trethomas, Machen ward, of which 1 was below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>When assessed against other sites in the Bedwas/Trethomas area, the site would be an appropriate allocation as it is a brownfield site within settlement limits. Further it is considered to be a realistic allocation given its location and planning consent. There are few other realistic alternative sites in the area that could be allocated instead.</p>			
A09	<p>The Grove</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site was granted full consent in 2006 for 13 dwellings.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Trethomas, which is identified as a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. Whilst it is recognised that the Bedwas Colliery site is in close proximity, the Colliery site is likely to come forward in the latter part of the plan period, whereas The Grove, which has a valid planning consent is likely to come forward earlier. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it maximises the use of land within settlement limits in an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. 	Trethomas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	HG1.63

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would not have any impact upon the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. ▪ The site is greenfield and therefore would not exploit brownfield opportunities <p>The Grove is considered to be an appropriate allocation as, even though it is a greenfield site, it is a natural infill site within the settlement, rather than being a settlement extension and conforms to other elements of the strategy. Furthermore, as the site has planning consent, it is considered to be a realistic proposition for development.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the Bedwas, Trethomas, Machen ward, of which 1 was below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>When assessed against other sites in the Bedwas/Trethomas area, the site would be an appropriate allocation as it is large enough to warrant an allocation as it is over the threshold of 10 dwellings. Although other sites such as E145 Trethomas Health Centre are brownfield, this site is considered to be a more realistic allocation given its location and planning consent.</p>			
A10	<p>Tyn y Waun Farm</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site was granted outline consent in 2001 and full consent for 4 dwellings on part of the site in 2006.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	Machen	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	HG1.60

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Machen, which is identified as a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it is brownfield land within settlement limits in an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It would not have any impact upon the countryside ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is a former ash tip <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. ▪ There would be the potential for some countryside impact given the proximity of the site to a SINC and the identification of priority habitats. However, the site has planning consent and should any additional applications be submitted, additional surveys will be required to be undertaken. <p>Tyn Y Waun Farm is considered to be an appropriate allocation as it is brownfield site, which is a natural infill site within the settlement. Furthermore, as the site has planning consent, it is considered to be a realistic proposition for development.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the Bedwas, Trethomas, Machen ward, of which 1 was below the site size threshold. Eight of these sites were in the Machen area, although only the Tyn Y Waun Farm site was deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	When assessed against other sites in the Bedwas/Trethomas area, the site would be a more suitable housing allocation as it large enough to warrant an allocation as it is over the threshold of 10 dwellings and conforms to the strategy.			
D03	<p>Land adjacent to Upper Glyn Gwyn Street</p> <p>Part of the site will be required to facilitate the provision of an access road to the Bedwas Colliery site. Given the number of units proposed on the Colliery site itself, it is not considered necessary to promote the land in question for additional housing as previously identified in the candidate site register. The site has instead been identified as a new country park allocation with an indicative alignment of an access road also being identified.</p>	Trethomas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Not allocated
D04	<p>Bedwas Colliery</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Bedwas, which is identified as a residential area. The strategy makes specific reference to Bedwas Colliery as offering an opportunity to expand the residential role of Bedwas. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it is brownfield land within settlement limits in an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as although the site represents a significant extension to the residential element of Bedwas and Trethomas, the site has been located within settlement limits within successive plans and would represent an appropriate 	Bedwas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	HG1.64

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>brownfield extension, reducing the need to release greenfield sites in the SCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It would not have any detrimental impact upon the countryside. In fact, the reclamation of this contaminated site is likely to provide environmental benefits ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is a former Colliery site and is in need of reclamation. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Bedwas Colliery is considered to be an appropriate allocation as it is a significant brownfield site in need remediation and its allocation would limit the need for greenfield releases elsewhere in the SCC.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the Bedwas, Trethomas, Machen ward, of which 1 was below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>However, given the significance of the site in providing housing in the Caerphilly Basin it is important that Bedwas Colliery is compared with other sites of a similar scale that could be brought forward as allocations. Given that Waterloo Works has already been allocated, the only other brownfield alternative of a similar scale in the Caerphilly Basin is D05 Ness Tar (St Martins ward).</p> <p>Due to highways constraints associated with the development of the Ness Tar site, it is considered that development can only come forward if it is linked to the provision of a bypass for South East Caerphilly. The provision of the bypass would result in the release of a substantial area of greenfield land, some of which has been designated a SINC and a Special Landscape Area. There are therefore significant ecological arguments against the provision of the road and associated housing that would need to be provided in order to ensure that development is viable</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Whilst the provision of the road has potential benefits of alleviating traffic congestion in Caerphilly town centre and linked air quality issues, there is insufficient evidence at the present time to justify the bypass on these grounds and therefore comprehensive investigation of the sources of the problem, and assessment of the alternative options will need to be undertaken. At the current time, Ness Tar is not considered to be a realistic alternative to Bedwas Colliery as the ecological and landscape impact of the greenfield release of the land required to provide a viable development would be substantial. The ecological and landscape impact on the development of Bedwas Colliery would comparatively be far less than Ness Tar and is considered to be a more realistic allocation.</p>			
D74	<p>Garth View</p> <p>The width of the access limits the capacity of the site to 5 dwellings. The site should therefore not be allocated, but considered as a small site within settlement limits.</p>	Bedwas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Not allocated
E145	<p>Trethomas Health Centre</p> <p>Whilst the principle of development on the site is acceptable, the health centre is still operational and therefore it would be more appropriate to actively promote the other suitable brownfield site in the area, namely Bedwas Colliery as well as those sites that have the benefit of planning consent. The site will not be allocated but will be left within the settlement boundary.</p>	Trethomas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Not allocated
A17	<p>South of the proposed link road</p> <p>The site is constrained by approximately one third of the site being designated as a SINC and TPO woodland. In addition, the Chartist Bridge located above the site is intrusive both visually and in terms of noise. It is a greenfield site and its development would have ecological and visual impacts. In light of this, it is deemed unacceptable to actively promote this as an allocation when less constrained brownfield sites are available in the strategy area. The site has therefore been removed from the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Whilst Blackwood is identified as a Principal town, it is not identified as an area to accommodate significant additional housing growth. During the previous plan period, the area has experienced</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Not allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>major growth and therefore, in the interests of promoting a balanced approach to growth, development should be directed towards areas that need housing to help sustain communities. It is considered that the limited brownfield redevelopments proposed in the town are in accordance with the strategic desire to promote brownfield opportunities and reducing the impact on the countryside. Further growth in Blackwood over and above this will be primarily dependent upon the release of edge of settlement greenfield sites, which will have negative effects on other aims and objectives of the Plan.</p>			
C24	<p>Land at Cwm Gelli</p> <p>Sites scores poorly in relation to the Strategy on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys (north) of the County Borough. • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities • The site would not be regarded as promoting the full and effective use of urban land as it is clearly an extension into the countryside • The site would be encroaching on prominent open countryside and therefore would not be considered as protecting or conserving the natural environment. • Whilst Blackwood is identified as a Principal town, it is not identified as an area to accommodate significant additional housing growth. During the previous plan period, the area has experienced major growth and therefore, in the interests of promoting a balanced approach to growth, development should be directed towards areas that need housing to help sustain communities. It is considered that the limited brownfield redevelopments proposed in the town are in accordance with the strategic desire to promote brownfield opportunities and reducing the impact on the countryside. Further growth in Blackwood over and above this will be dependent upon the release of edge of settlement greenfield sites, which will have negative effects on other aims and objectives of the Plan. <p>The site was considered as part of the UDP Inquiry. Paragraph 2.48.2 of the UDP Inspectors Report states <i>“it is my opinion that the allocation of this site for housing would be wholly inappropriate. Such development would amount to a significant spread of the urban settlement into a particularly conspicuous stretch of countryside alongside a main approach into Blackwood and this would cause appreciable harm to the character and appearance of these immediate surroundings. It would also</i></p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Not allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p><i>be likely to damage the setting of the farmhouse and associated barns which are Grade II Listed Buildings and could adversely effect the grounds of the Maes Manor Hotel which are included in the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.”</i></p> <p>It is considered that this view is still valid within the current planning context.</p>			
D15	<p>Land at Berllangron Cottages</p> <p>Further consideration of this site indicates that the Chartist Bridge located above the site is intrusive both visually and in terms of noise. In addition, the bridge forms a defensible northern boundary to Blackwood and therefore the development of the site would be considered to be an erosion of the open countryside.</p> <p>Whilst Blackwood is identified as a Principal town, it is not identified as an area to accommodate significant additional housing growth. During the previous plan period, the area has experienced major growth and therefore, in the interests of promoting a balanced approach to growth, development should be directed towards areas that need housing to help sustain communities. It is considered that the limited brownfield redevelopments proposed in the town are in accordance with the strategic desire to promote brownfield opportunities and reducing the impact on the countryside. Further growth in Blackwood over and above this will be dependent upon the release of edge of settlement greenfield sites, which will have negative effects on other aims and objectives of the Plan.</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Not allocated
D171	<p>South of Thorncombe Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but a planning application had been submitted at the time of plan preparation, demonstrating that the site was realistically likely to be developed. The assessment undertaken as part of the planning application indicated that the site was suitable in principle for development. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	HG1.31

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located in Blackwood, which is a Principal Town, although its role is identified in the strategy as focusing on retailing rather than being an area subject to significant new housing development there remains a need to ensure that new housing sites complement and support the primary function of the town. The strategy indicates that residential development will be concentrated in the mid valleys conurbation, along with other settlements with good rail access. A small site of this nature would conform to the role and function of the area. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed to an area that has the capacity to accommodate it, reducing the need for greenfield extensions. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield. <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Blackwood ward, of which 5 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>Whilst the site is small in scale it will contribute to the choice of housing in an area that has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years. It is recognised that the site is greenfield but it is not a settlement extension, rather it is an infill site well related to the town centre and Blackwood Gate Retail part. It will complement the allocation of other small scale sites in the area, meaning that a greenfield settlement extension such as Cwm Gelli would not be required.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
E25	<p>Land east of Bryn Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable for development and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In relation to whether the site accords with the role and function of settlements, the site is located on the boundary between Cefn Fforest and Blackwood, although in reality forms part of one contiguous urban area. Although Blackwood 's role is identified in the strategy as focusing on its function as a retail area there remains a need to ensure that new housing sites complement and support the primary function of the town. The strategy also indicates that residential development within this area will be concentrated in the mid valleys conurbation, along with other settlements with good rail access. A small site of this nature would conform to the role and function of the area. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed to an area that has the capacity to accommodate it, reducing the need for greenfield sites to be released. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is currently a depot ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p>	Cefn Fforest	Blackwood	HG1.30

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Land east of Bryn Road is brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity at a relatively small scale, which is appropriate given that level of development that Blackwood has experienced in recent years.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Blackwood ward, of which 5 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>Whilst the site is small in scale it will contribute to the choice of housing in an area that has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years. It represents an appropriate brownfield opportunity in an area where the only significant new development opportunities are greenfield settlement extensions. The allocation of this site, along with other brownfield sites of a similar scale (HG1.28, HG1.29) conform better to the strategy than greenfield sites such as Cwm Gelli.</p>			
E139/E147	<p>Blackwood Ambulance Station/ Tyr Sirhowy Mental Health Unit</p> <p>These two sites have been taken forward as one housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that these sites are suitable for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the combined site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located within Blackwood, which is identified as a Principal Town. Although Blackwood 's role is identified in the strategy as focusing on its function as a retail area there remains a need to ensure that new housing sites complement and support the primary 	Blackwood	Blackwood	HG1.28

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>function of the town. The strategy also indicates that residential development will be concentrated in the mid valleys conurbation, along with other settlements with good rail access. A small site of this nature would conform to the role and function of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed to an area that has the capacity to accommodate it, reducing the need for greenfield sites to be released. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is currently used as a psychiatric hospital and ambulance station. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Blackwood Ambulance Station is brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity at a relatively small scale, which is appropriate given that level of development that Blackwood has experienced in recent years.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Blackwood ward, of which 5 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p> <p>Whilst the site is small in scale it will contribute to the choice of housing in an area that has already experienced significant housing growth in recent years. It represents an appropriate brownfield opportunity in an area where the only significant new development opportunities are greenfield settlement extensions. The allocation of this site, along with other brownfield sites of a similar scale (HG1.29, HG1.30) conform better to the strategy than greenfield sites such as Cwm Gelli.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
E277	Land at Cwm Gelli Discussed under site C24.	Blackwood	Blackwood	Not allocated
B18/E121	<p>Pencoed Avenue</p> <p>The adjacent sites of B18 and E121 have been taken forward as one combined housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. Both sites had valid outline planning consents for housing as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that these sites are suitable for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the combined site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located within Cefn Fforest, which is identified as a residential area. It also forms part of the greater Blackwood conurbation and would accord with Blackwood's role as a Principal Town. The strategy indicates that residential development will be concentrated in the mid valleys conurbation, along with other settlements with good rail access. A small site of this nature would conform to the role and function of the area. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth. It utilises an under-used and partially brownfield site, thus ensuring development is directed away from those areas worthy of significant environmental protection. ▪ The site would exploit brownfield opportunities. Although some of the site is undeveloped, the southern-most part is currently occupied by a large garage/workshop and there were previously a number of garages in the northern part of the site, which have now been demolished. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, although it is an extension to Cefn Fforest, the site is well related to the settlement and is partially brownfield. 	Cefn Fforest	Cefn Fforest	HG1.29

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ It could potentially have an impact on the countryside as the northern part of the site has been identified as important as a wildlife corridor. <p>Pencoed Avenue is a partially brownfield under-used site which is suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity at a relatively small scale, which is appropriate given that level of development that the Blackwood area has experienced in recent years. Furthermore, as the site has planning consent, it is considered to be a realistic proposition for development.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 5 candidate sites were submitted in the Cefn Fforest ward, of which 2 were below the site size threshold. The two sites at Pencoed Avenue were the only sites deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given that there are very few sites that are suitable for further consideration identified in the Blackwood/Cefn Fforest area, this site best accords with the strategy and it is appropriate therefore that the site has been taken forward as an allocation.</p>			
498/B16	<p>Land at Hillary Rise</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has a valid planning consent for housing.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that this site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the</p>	Pontywaun	Crosskeys	HG1.52

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located within Pontywaun, which is a residential area. In settlements that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing may be appropriate in diversifying the housing stock. Pontywaun has experienced little growth in recent years due to the topography and flood risk constraints in the area. Settlements served by good rail access are also considered to be appropriate for new development and the site is in walking distance of the Crosskeys rail halt. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would provide housing in an area that has experienced little growth in the past. It is recognised that the site is adjacent to the Pontywaun Garden Suburbs conservation area and listed buildings, but the fact that planning consent has been granted on the site demonstrates that appropriately designed housing can be achieved without harm to the historic and conservation interest. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, although it is greenfield, it is essentially an infill site as residential development exists to the north, east and west. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. ▪ It could potentially have an impact on the countryside as the role of part of the site as a wildlife corridor has been identified. ▪ It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield. <p>Whilst the land at Hillary Rise is greenfield, it offers the only development opportunity in the wider Pontywaun/Crosskeys area, which is an area significantly constrained by flood risk and topography. A small-scale development of this nature would accord with the role and function of the area and diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, the site already has the benefit of planning consent and is therefore a realistic development opportunity.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 7 candidate sites were submitted in the Crosskeys ward, of which 2 were below the site size threshold. Hilary Rise is the only site deemed suitable for further consideration for residential use. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR.</p> <p>Hillary Rise is the only suitable site identified in the wider Pontywaun/Crosskeys area in an area which has experienced little housing growth. As there are no other suitable sites identified, it is considered appropriate to allocate the site as it best adheres to the strategy and given that it has planning consent it is realistic.</p>			
C11	<p>Pontywaun Farm</p> <p>The site was identified as most suitable for sport or leisure use, due to the ecological constraints, zone C flood risk designation and the location of a major trunk sewer through the site, which are significant constraints to built development. Given these constraints, it is not considered appropriate to include a site of this size within the settlement boundary, as it is not realistically anticipated to come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>Furthermore, given the difficulty of accessing the site by modes other than the car, it has not been taken forward as a leisure allocation, although can continue to be used for informal leisure.</p>	Pontywaun	Crosskeys	Not Allocated
761	<p>Land within curtilage of The Pentwyn Inn</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent for housing.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p>	Trinant	Crumlin	HG1.24

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Trinant, which is a residential area. The strategy indicates that limited housing development would be acceptable as this is an area where there is a need for a greater variety of housing. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it will help spread prosperity through the County Borough. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site is an infill site surrounded by residential development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield <p>This site represents an appropriate development opportunity on previously developed land in an area with few major development opportunities. The site conforms to the strategy and it considered to be a realistic proposition for development given that the site has planning consent.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 35 candidate sites were submitted in the Crumlin ward, although only three of the sites were in the Trinant area. None of the sites identified in Trinant were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR. Although not submitted through the candidate site process, the site has planning consent and represents a realistic development opportunity that conforms to the strategy.</p>			
1382	<p>The Stores, Albertina Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent for housing.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007,</p>	Newbridge	Crumlin	HG1.46

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Newbridge, which is a Key Settlement. The strategy indicates that housing development would be acceptable as this is an area where there is a need for a greater variety of housing. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would represent an efficient use of land within the NCC ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as although it is a small settlement extension it is well related to existing development and is a natural rounding off. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield. <p>This site represents an appropriate development opportunity in an area with few development opportunities. The site conforms to the strategy and it is considered to be a realistic proposition for development given that the site has planning consent.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 35 candidate sites were submitted in the Crumlin ward. The site is well related to the settlement of Newbridge, where 23 candidate sites have been submitted. Several sites in Newbridge have been deemed suitable for further consideration The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 2 and 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Although not submitted through the candidate site process, the site has planning consent and represents a realistic development opportunity as a result of this. It will add to the diversity of</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	housing sites in this area, alongside 1554, A19 and A21. It is the only site in the Treowen part of Newbridge, which has experienced very little development in recent years.			
D14	Land at Croespenmaen Industrial Estate The site is a duplicate of site E103 and is discussed under this reference.	Croespenmaen	Crumlin	Not Allocated
D17	Land adjacent to Navigation Industrial Park Part of site is considered under reference E111. The remainder of the site is allocated as a SINC.	Crumlin	Crumlin	Not Allocated
E31	Land north of Pendinas Avenue The site was allocated as informal leisure within the UDP, although the site is gated and is therefore not used for this purpose. As the site is not being utilised for leisure purposes, it would be inappropriate to allocate the land within the context of the LDP. The Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (MIPPS) for housing indicates that in deciding which sites should be allocated for housing, consideration should be given to the capacity of existing infrastructure including social infrastructure such as schools. As part of the evidence base for the LDP, the education department have been consulted and it has been indicated that the local school cannot accommodate the pupils that could potentially be generated from the development of this site as there is insufficient expansion space for new classrooms to be accommodated. Given this, it is considered inappropriate to allocate the site for housing. However, the site will be left unallocated within the settlement boundary to allow the site to come forward should education issues be resolved in the future.	Croespenmaen	Crumlin	Not Allocated
E103	Site of GB Engineering and adjacent Industrial Land The Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (MIPPS) for housing indicates that in deciding which sites should be allocated for housing, consideration should be given to the capacity of existing	Croespenmaen	Crumlin	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>infrastructure including social infrastructure such as schools. As part of the evidence base for the LDP, the education department have been consulted and it has been indicated that the local school cannot accommodate the pupils that could potentially be generated from the development of this site as there is insufficient expansion space for new classrooms to be accommodated. Given this, it is considered inappropriate to allocate the site for housing. However, the site will be left unallocated within the settlement boundary to allow the site to come forward should education issues be resolved in the future</p>			
E111	<p>Navigation Colliery</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the Candidate Sites Register (CSR) indicates that the site is suitable for development in principle. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable for development and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Crumlin, which is identified as a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it maximises the use of brownfield land in the NCC and would provide housing close to employment opportunities at Oakdale and Penyfan. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former colliery. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. 	Crumlin	Crumlin	HG1.25

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ The site adjoins a SINC and concern has been raised as part of the consultation process regarding the potential impact of development on this. In addition there are records of bats on the site. However, it is considered that the countryside impact is likely to be minimal as any adverse impacts could be mitigated. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 35 candidate sites were submitted in the Crumlin ward, although only three of these sites were in Crumlin itself. Based on further consideration this is the only suitable site for inclusion as a housing allocation. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given the site's conformity with the strategy, this site represents the best choice of allocation, albeit noting that there are a number of other allocations within the nearby settlement of Newbridge.</p> <p>NOTE – This site is now recommended for removal as a housing allocation</p>			
E166	<p>Land east of Treowen Road</p> <p>Further consideration of the site has indicated that the site would not be suitable due to a lack of visibility and lack of safe pedestrian access.</p>	Treowen	Crumlin	Not Allocated
D37	<p>Land off Railway Terrace</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable, subject to the developer funding improvements to the sewerage and gas network if the site is developed in advance of any regulatory improvement. The site would meet the</p>	Fochriw	Darren Valley	HG1.12

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Fochriw, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA area ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to the existing settlement. Terraced housing was originally located on this site but this has since been demolished ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ As a former residential area, the allocation of the site would exploit brownfield opportunities. ▪ It is not considered that there will be any significant ecological impact if the site is allocated. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 22 candidate sites were submitted in the Darren Valley ward, although 3 of these were below the site size threshold. Only 3 of these sites were in Fochriw. Railway Terrace and F6 were the only sites deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR.</p> <p>As the only significant brownfield site which is suitable for development and conforms to the strategy in Fochriw, Railway Terrace is therefore an appropriate development opportunity, particularly in this area where a greater diversity of housing would be welcomed. It conforms better to the strategy than F6, which is a greenfield site.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
D42	<p>Land off Cefn Road</p> <p>A previous planning consent indicated that the site only has a capacity of 7 dwellings due to the topography of the land and therefore should not be allocated but should remain within settlement limits.</p>	Deri	Darren Valley	Not Allocated
D43	<p>Land adjacent to New Road</p> <p>The majority of the site lies within Zone C of the flood plain and, in the interests of promoting a precautionary approach to the selection of sites with zone C and in response to comments made by the Environment Agency, it is not considered appropriate to take the site forward.</p>	Deri	Darren Valley	Not Allocated
F6	<p>East of Fochriw</p> <p>There were two sites identified as suitable for further consideration for housing within the CSR in the settlement of Fochriw. Whilst the Strategy promotes development in the north of the County Borough, this growth should be realistic to the role and function of settlements. The Strategy noted that limited housing development would be acceptable in the village and therefore it is considered that the allocation of two significant sites in the village would go beyond what is considered to be a balanced approach to growth.</p> <p>Site F6 is more constrained in highways terms due to the need to widen the road to ensure access can be achieved. In addition, D37 has received developer interest and is a brownfield opportunity on a site previously used for residential purposes, although existing terraces on the site have now been cleared, whereas F6 is a greenfield site. It is therefore deemed that D37 is most in accordance with the strategy and has been allocated accordingly.</p>	Fochriw	Darren Valley	Not Allocated
B24	<p>Valley View</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent as of 1st April 2007.</p>	Hengoed	Hengoed	HG1.39

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Hengoed, which is identified in the strategy as a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth allows for development opportunities in an area well served by the rail network at an appropriate scale for the settlement. ▪ Whilst the site is clearly a settlement extension, it relates well to the existing settlement in an area where residential development had previously been anticipated as indicated by the surrounding road layout ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ The site adjoins a SINC and concern has been raised as part of the consultation process regarding the potential impact of development on this. ▪ It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 12 candidate sites were submitted in the Hengoed ward, although 1 of these were below the site size threshold. None of these were suitable for further consideration for housing. Although not submitted as a Candidate Site, Valley View represents an appropriate development opportunity. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 1 of the CSR.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	Whilst it is recognised that the site does represent a small Greenfield settlement extension, the site has planning consent and therefore represents a realistic development opportunity in the Mid Valleys conurbation in an area with few development opportunities on brownfield sites.			
D61	<p>Land off Penallta Road</p> <p>In light of an identified need for allotments within the Ystrad Mynach area, this former allotment site will be retained for allotment use.</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Hengoed	Not Allocated
E58	<p>Cefn Hengoed Community Centre</p> <p>The site was incorrectly identified in the candidate site register and should relate to Cefn Hengoed Youth Centre, which was under the site size threshold. No further consideration was therefore given through this process, as it was a small site.</p>	Cefn Hengoed	Hengoed	Not Allocated
1119/A14	<p>Jeremy Oils</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent for housing as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the Candidate Sites Register (CSR) indicates that the site is suitable for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Llanbradach, which is identified as a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. 	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	HG1.79

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it maximises the use of brownfield land in the SCC, which is an area with limited environmental capacity ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site had a previous industrial use ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ There is no anticipated impact on the countryside from this allocation. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Jeremy Oils is brownfield, suitable for development and conforms to the strategy and is therefore an appropriate development opportunity. Furthermore, the fact that it had consent for housing demonstrates that it is realistic.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 12 candidate sites were submitted in Llanbradach, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. Several of these sites were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR.</p> <p>Flood risk is a particular concern in Llanbradach, which much of the settlement lying within Zone C. This issue was resolved as part of the application on Jeremy Oils, but it has not been demonstrated that other sites in the area are free from flooding. In light of this it is considered that Jeremy Oils represents the most sustainable site available in Llanbradach given the known constraints associated with flooding.</p>			
D90	<p>Land at the rear of Wingfield Crescent</p> <p>The site is constrained by its location within a C1/C2 Flood Risk area where highly vulnerable development would be unacceptable. As a result, it would be inappropriate to actively promote this site for residential development. However, the site has been left within settlement limits and, subject</p>	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	to the completion of a Flood Consequences Assessment, may be acceptable for development.			
E196	<p>Land at Morgan Street, north of community centre.</p> <p>The site is considered most appropriate to retain its existing use so it will be left within settlement limits.</p>	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Not Allocated
E211	<p>Land at Wingfield Works</p> <p>The site is constrained by its location within a zone C flood risk area where highly vulnerable development would be unacceptable. As a result, the LDP has sought to adopt the precautionary approach to preclude residential development in the flood plain where possible.</p> <p>However, the brownfield part of the site (the western extent) has been left within settlement limits and, subject to the completion of an acceptable Flood Consequences Assessment, may be acceptable for development. The remainder of the site has been excluded from the settlement boundary, as it is an important area of open space.</p>	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Not Allocated
A23	<p>Land at Hawtin Park</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Pontllanfraith, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of 	Gellihaf	Maesycwmmmer	HG1.32

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. Whilst it is recognised that the site is large, it represents one of the only significant sites in the wider Pontllanfraith/Blackwood/Fleur de Lys area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as provides housing in an area where a number of employment opportunities also exist. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and represents an appropriate extension to the settlement given that housing lies to the east and south and employment lies north (existing and proposed). ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield. ▪ The site is a SINC and concern has been raised as part of the consultation process regarding the potential impact of development on this SINC. However, this site was previously considered as part of the UDP Inquiry where the Inspector included the site as a housing allocation on the grounds that he was satisfied that suitable design safeguards could be included at planning application stage to ensure no material harm in environmental, nature conservation or traffic safety terms, <p>Whilst the site is greenfield and notably has some ecological value, it represents a natural extension to Pontllanfraith and would contribute to the housing in the Mid Valleys conurbation without significant detriment to the open countryside.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the ward of Maesycwmmmer, which the site lies within. However, the site has a better relationship with the settlement of Pontllanfraith where 22 sites were submitted, 5 of which were below the site size threshold. No other sites within the settlement of Pontllanfraith were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	As there are no other suitable sites in Pontllanfraith and there is a need to take a balanced approach to ensure that development is spread across the County Borough. It is necessary to make some greenfield releases where no brownfield sites are available. In light of this, the release of this site which represents a natural rounding off of the settlement is favoured.			
D57	<p>Land at Holly House Nursing Home, Victoria Road</p> <p>The site scores poorly in relation to the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys area in the north of the County Borough • Development should be targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements - Fleur de Lys is not identified as an area for future residential growth as it has a range of housing types. In addition, the site is poorly related to the main centre of Fleur de Lys. • The allocation of this site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns – the site is located on the southern edge of Fleur de Lys and its development for housing would constitute ribbon development. • Reduce the impact of development on the countryside – only a small area of the site is acceptable as the site is constrained by TPOs and a SINC. <p>In light of this it is considered that the site should not be taken forward as an allocation as other sites within the strategy area score better. It should be noted that the constraints on the site limit the development to the footprint of the existing nursing home and consequently the developable area is likely to fall below the site size threshold necessary for development. The site has however been retained within the settlement boundary.</p>	Fleur-de-Lys	Maesycwmmmer	Not Allocated
D59	<p>Land to the North of Bryn Meadows Golf Club</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.</p>	Pontllanfraith	Maesycwmmmer	Not Allocated
D60	Land at Gellideg Lane	Maesycwmmmer	Maesycwmmmer	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.			
E189	<p>Land at Gellideg Heights</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Maesycwmmmer, which is a residential area. In those areas that have a residential role, the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement will help diversify the housing stock. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as provides housing in an area that is well served by the rail network. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and represents an appropriate redevelopment of brownfield land. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site primarily had a former industrial use. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ Part of the candidate site was identified as having ecological value. However, the boundary 	Maesycwmmmer	Maesycwmmmer	HG1.43

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p style="text-align: center;">of the allocated site does not include the areas with the highest ecological value.</p> <p>The site represents an appropriate redevelopment of industrial units in an area well served by public transport on a site that conforms well to the strategy.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the ward of Maesycwmmmer, of which 1 was small. Several of the sites, notably including several sites around Gellideg Heights, were taken forward for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 2 of the CSR.</p> <p>A number of settlement extensions were proposed in and around the Gellideg Heights site. When the sites were considered holistically, it was important to ensure that only those areas that would cause least environmental harm be considered for inclusion in the plan. Furthermore the need to provide a defensible settlement boundary for this part of Maesycwmmmer was considered important in determining the extent of any allocation, given the significant development pressure on land within the area. A comparison was made with site E233 and it was concluded that this site represented a significant greenfield extension to Maesycwmmmer and conformed poorly to the strategy. Conversely, the allocated site represents the most suitable area for development taking into account all known site constraints.</p>			
E233	<p>Land at Gwernau Ganol and Gwernau Fawr Farms</p> <p>The site scores poorly in relation to the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a greenfield site and therefore would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not located in Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area in the north of the County Borough. • The development would not be considered to be resource efficient as would be considered to be a significant extension into the open countryside. • The countryside impact of the proposed development would be significant as it is partially covered by a SINC. 	Maesycwmmmer	Maesycwmmmer	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site has the capacity to accommodate over 1000 dwellings, although in line with the strategy it would be more appropriate to balanced growth across the County Borough rather than promoting a significant amount of development in one location.</p> <p>In light of the poor conformity with the strategy, the ecological value of the site and the availability of other sites in the Maesycwmmmer area, which are in accordance with the strategy, it is not considered appropriate to take the site forward. The site has therefore been left outside of the settlement boundary.</p>			
E295	<p>Land at Gellideg Heights</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.</p>	Maesycwmmmer	Maesycwmmmer	Not Allocated
E349	<p>Land south of Gellideg Heights</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.</p>	Maesycwmmmer	Maesycwmmmer	Not Allocated
B11	<p>Gas Works Site, Mill Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent subject to the signing of a Section 106 as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	HG1.71

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and is an infill site. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former Gas Works. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. ▪ The woodland and scrub in the north of the site is considered to be important, although mitigation could be included as part of any development <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether it has planning consent as there are a large number of sites in the Caerphilly Basin with consent that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated. The allocation of sites with planning consent that meet the strategy was considered the most appropriate in providing certainty in respect of the</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	location of new development. In this context, the Gas Works site, as a brownfield opportunity with developer interests considered to be an appropriate allocation.			
D09	<p>Land at Pontypandy Industrial Estate</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need, ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and is an infill site with an industrial estate to the north, housing to the south and retail to the east ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is partially brownfield, as there is an existing residential use on part of the site. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. 	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	HG1.67

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The southern part of the site is identified as having some ecological and landscape value, although this issue has been given due consideration as part of the planning application. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether it has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated. The allocation of sites with planning consent that meet the strategy was considered the most appropriate in providing certainty in respect of the location of new development. Given that this site is an infill site and has planning consent (subject to S106) it is considered to represent an appropriate allocation.</p>			
D75	<p>St Ilans Comprehensive</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site boundary has been extended to incorporate additional land on the opposite side of the river to ensure that development was sustainable by optimising the re-use of the listed St Ilans School buildings.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	HG1.68

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need. In addition, it would also facilitate the improvement to two primary schools and provide leisure facilities. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and is an infill site with housing and a supermarket adjacent to the site. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is predominately brownfield, as it comprises primarily of school buildings. ▪ There will be limited impact of the countryside. Whilst the site does contain a section of scrub that was allocated as a SINC in the UDP, this SINC designation has been removed in the LDP due to a significant decline in the ecological value of this area. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated. The allocation of sites with planning consent where they meet the strategy was considered the most appropriate in providing certainty in respect of the location of new development. St Ilans does not have planning consent but is a sustainable site well related to the town centre and is an appropriate infill which seeks to maximise the re-use of existing listed buildings as well as provide housing, including affordable housing.</p> <p>NOTE – This site is now recommended for removal as a housing allocation</p>			
D169	<p>Venosa Trading Estate</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but a planning application had been submitted at the time of plan preparation, demonstrating that the site was realistically likely to be developed. The assessment undertaken as part of the planning application indicated that the site was suitable in principle for development. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to existing residential development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is predominately brownfield, as it comprises an industrial estate. ▪ There will be limited impact of the countryside. 	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	HG1.66

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent, as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated. The allocation of sites with planning consent where they meet the strategy was considered most appropriate in providing certainty in respect of the location of new development. Venosa Trading Estate is brownfield, well related to the town centre and has been subject to a planning application, demonstrating that it is a realistic proposition for development.</p>			
E204	<p>Land adjacent to existing Asda store, Pontygwindy Road</p> <p>The site was considered most suitable for employment use in the CSR, as retail would be contrary to national retail planning policy. Further consideration has determined that it would not be considered appropriate for an employment site to be served off the same access as a supermarket. Furthermore, the Atkins Study on employment land identified that there were sufficient employment land allocated in the County Borough and, given that the site is divorced for any other allocated or protected industrial estates, it is not considered appropriate to take the site forward for further consideration.</p> <p>However, as the site is located within the settlement, the site should remain within the settlement boundary, but not actively be promoted as an allocation.</p>	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
1163	<p>Maerdy Garage adj to Maerdy House</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Rhymney which is a Key Settlement where residential development will be concentrated as a means of introducing a range and choice of housing types and tenures. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to existing development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former garage and industrial unit. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>The Key Settlement of Rhymney is split across the wards of Moriah and Twyn Carno. Collectively, 26 candidate sites were submitted, although 4 of these were below the site size threshold. Seven candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration in Rhymney itself in addition to this site, which had the benefit of planning consent. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p>	Rhymney	Moriah	HG1.05

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Further assessment of the suitable sites has indicated that only this site, Maerdy Crossing, the Old Barrel Store and Lower Hill Street represent realistic propositions for development. Given the strategy aim of providing a range of sites, there is merit in allocating a number of sites to support the role and function of the Key Settlement. This is particularly relevant when it is considered that the sites in Rhymney are primarily smaller than sites in the NCC and SCC. Maerdy Garage, although smaller than other sites, is brownfield and is well related to the town centre and proposed new health and resource centre. It is in a sustainable location and therefore conforms to the strategy. Furthermore, the fact that it has planning consent is an indication that it represents a realistic proposition for development.</p>			
A02	<p>Old Barrel Store</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Rhymney which is a Key Settlement where residential development will be concentrated as a means of introducing a range and choice of housing types and tenures. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to existing development. 	Rhymney	Moriah	HG1.03

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site has a former industrial use. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>The Key Settlement of Rhymney is split across the wards of Moriah and Twyn Carno. Collectively, 26 candidate sites were submitted, although 4 of these were below the site size threshold. Seven candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration in Rhymney itself in addition to this site, which had the benefit of planning consent. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Further assessment of the suitable sites has indicated that only this site, Maerdy Crossing, the Maerdy Garage and Lower Hill Street represent realistic propositions for development. Given the strategy aim of providing a range of sites, there is merit in allocating a number of sites to support the role and function of the Key Settlement. This is particularly relevant when it is considered that the sites in Rhymney are primarily smaller than sites in the NCC and SCC. The Old Barrel Store is brownfield and is well related to the town centre, station and supermarket. It is in a sustainable location and therefore conforms to the strategy. Furthermore, the fact that it has planning consent is an indication that it represents a realistic proposition for development.</p>			
A03	<p>Lower Hill Street</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the</p>	Rhymney	Moriah	HG1.04

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Rhymney which is a Key Settlement where residential development will be concentrated as a means of introducing a range and choice of housing types and tenures. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to existing development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>The Key Settlement of Rhymney is split across the wards of Moriah and Twyn Carno. Collectively, 26 candidate sites were submitted, although 4 of these were below the site size threshold. Seven candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration in Rhymney itself in addition to this site, which had the benefit of planning consent. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Further assessment of the suitable sites has indicated that only this site, Maerdy Crossing, the Maerdy Garage and the Old Barrel Store represent realistic propositions for development. Given the strategy aim of providing a range of sites, there is merit in allocating a number of sites to support the role and function of the Key Settlement. This is particularly relevant when it is considered that the sites in Rhymney are primarily smaller than sites in the NCC and SCC. Whilst it is recognised that the site conforms less well to the strategy than other sites insofar as it is greenfield and slightly further in distance to the town centre, however it is well related to the primary school and is an infill site in a residential area, rather than being a settlement extension. In seeking to diversify housing</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	stock, the allocation of this site would add to the range of sites available.			
B01	<p>Greensway</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Abertyswg where there is a need for modern housing to maintain the viability of this mining village. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns, as, although it is an extension to the settlement, it is an appropriate rounding off given the pattern of existing development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site has previously been developed. The remnants of a significant hard standing still remain on the site. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the ward of Moriah, although only 5 different sites were in Abertyswg. Four candidate sites in the settlement were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites is set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p>	Abertyswg	Moriah	HG1.09

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>In determining which sites to take forward in Abertysswg consideration was given to what an appropriate level of growth would be for the settlement. The land south west of Carn y Tyla Terrace (E265) had been granted planning consent (subject to S106) as of 1st April 2007. This is a Greenfield site capable of accommodating approximately 133 dwellings. Taken together with the land at Greensway, a brownfield site capable of accommodating approximately 28 dwellings, which has had planning consent in the past (now lapsed), it was considered that a sufficient amount of land had been allocated within Abertysswg to serve the needs of the area over the plan period. The allocation of another significant greenfield site such as D35 or D36 was not considered necessary or desirable in terms of the likely level of development that would be attracted or needed in this area over the plan period.</p>			
B17	<p>Maerdy Crossing</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Rhymney which is a Key Settlement where residential development will be concentrated as a means of introducing a range and choice of housing types and tenures. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits 	Rhymney	Moriah	HG1.06

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>and is well related to existing development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site has previously been used for industrial purposes. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>The Key Settlement of Rhymney is split across the wards of Moriah and Twyn Carno. Collectively, 26 candidate sites were submitted, although 4 of these were below the site size threshold. Seven candidate sites in the ward were deemed suitable for further consideration in Rhymney itself in addition to this site, which had the benefit of planning consent. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Further assessment of the suitable sites has indicated that only this site, Lower Hill Street, Maerdy Garage and the Old Barrel Store represent realistic propositions for development. Given the strategy aim of providing a range of sites, there is merit in allocating a number of sites to support the role and function of the Key Settlement. This is particularly relevant when it is considered that the sites in Rhymney are primarily smaller than sites in the NCC and SCC. This site conforms well to the strategy, although slightly further in distance to the town centre than other sites. In seeking to diversify housing stock, the allocation of this site would add to the range of sites available.</p>			
D34	<p>Land opposite Carn-y-tyla Terrace</p> <p>Site is a duplicate and has been considered under reference E265.</p>	Abertysswg	Moriah	See HG1.10
D35	<p>Land adjacent to Alexander Street and Glyn Street</p> <p>The Strategy states that limited housing development will be encouraged in residential villages in the Heads of the Valleys area, including Abertysswg. Site E265 has recently been granted outline planning consent, which will provide approximately 133 new units to help diversify the housing stock. In addition, in order to regenerate the eastern part of the village, it is considered appropriate to</p>	Abertysswg	Moriah	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>include a relatively small site (B01 Greensway) as the principle of residential development has been established on the site by the virtue of a previously planning consent, which has now lapsed. In addition, the site would constitute a natural rounding off of the settlement.</p> <p>The other sites proposed in Abertysswg would constitute significant extensions to the village and, taking into account existing consents, further development would be at a level beyond what is considered to be a sustainable level of population growth given the Plan identifies that only limited growth should occur in this settlement. The site has not therefore been taken forward.</p>			
D36	<p>Land opposite Arthurs Street</p> <p>The Strategy states that limited housing development will be encouraged in residential villages in the Heads of the Valleys area, including Abertysswg. Site E265 has recently been granted outline planning consent, which will provide approximately 133 new units to help diversify the housing stock. In addition, in order to regenerate the eastern part of the village, it is considered appropriate to include a relatively small site (B01 Greensway) as the principle of residential development has been established on the site by the virtue of a previously planning consent, which has now lapsed. In addition, the site would constitute a natural rounding off of the settlement.</p> <p>The other sites proposed in Abertysswg would constitute significant extensions to the village and, taking into account existing consents, further development would be at a level beyond what is considered to be a sustainable level of population growth given the Plan identifies that only limited growth should occur in this settlement. The site has not therefore been taken forward.</p>	Abertysswg	Moriah	Not Allocated
E38	<p>Land adjacent to Arthur Street</p> <p>Discussed under D36.</p>	Abertysswg	Moriah	Not Allocated
E225	<p>Land adjacent to Alexander Street and Glyn Street</p> <p>Discussed under D35,</p>	Abertysswg	Moriah	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
E265	<p>Land fronting Waun Terrace/ Land south west of Carn Y Tyla Terrace, Abertyswg</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Abertyswg where there is a need for modern housing to maintain the viability of this mining village. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, although it is an extension to the settlement, it reflects the pattern of existing development and is within an area that is currently within settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. ▪ As a greenfield extension there will be some impact on the countryside, with particular reference being made to potential loss of trees and hedgerows. <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the ward of Moriah, although only 5 different sites were</p>	Abertyswg	Moriah	HG1.10

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>in Abertysswg. Four candidate sites in the settlement were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites is set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>In determining which sites to take forward in Abertysswg consideration was given to what an appropriate level of growth would be for the settlement. The land south west of Carn y Tyla Terrace (E265) had been granted planning consent (subject to S106) as of 1st April 2007. This is a Greenfield site capable of accommodating approximately 133 dwellings. Taken together with the land at Greensway, a brownfield site capable of accommodating approximately 28 dwellings, which has had planning consent in the past (now lapsed), it was considered that a sufficient amount of land had been allocated within Abertysswg to serve the needs of the area over the plan period. The allocation of another significant greenfield site such as D35 or D36 was not considered necessary or desirable in terms of the likely level of development that would be attracted or needed in this area over the plan period.</p>			
E379	<p>Land to the rear of Benjamin Court</p> <p>In assessing the site against the Strategy, the site scores poorly in relation to three component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site is not considered to promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends into the open countryside. • The allocation of this site is not considered to reduce the impact of development on the countryside as it is considered that the site is visually prominent. It is noted in the Strategy that, where settlements are identified for growth, regard should be had for the need to protect and/or conserve those aspects of the natural environment that are valued for their landscape, biodiversity or agricultural interest. This site would be more intrusive on the landscape than other sites that are better related to the town. <p>In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, a search sequence should be followed, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p>	Rhymney	Moriah	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Within Rhymney, there are a number of brownfield sites (B17, 1163, A02) that, by virtue of planning consent, and/or their proximity to the train station and shops, would be regarded as more acceptable than greenfield settlement extensions. The site has therefore not been taken forward for further consideration.</p>			
1158	<p>Former Cattle Market Site</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Nelson as a Key Settlement, where new housing should be targeted. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed across the County Borough. The allocation for housing would also compliment the proposed office development at Ty Du. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former cattle market. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 13 candidate sites were submitted in the Nelson ward, of which 1 was below the site size</p>	Nelson	Nelson	HG1.42

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>If a comparison is made between all sites suitable for further consideration it will be noted that many of the sites represent significant greenfield extension, whereas the Cattle Market site and the Handball Court site are both brownfield sites within settlement limits, It is considered that the provision of housing from these two sites would be sufficient for the settlement of Nelson to build on its existing role and function. The release of greenfield sites, which are likely to be larger in scale, would not only relate poorly to the strategy but would also have a significant impact on landscape and ecology in the area.</p>			
A06	<p>Land to the east of Handball Court</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Nelson as a Key Settlement, where new housing should be targeted. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed across the County Borough. The allocation for housing would also compliment the proposed office development at Ty Du. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities, as there a number of workshop units on the site and the area is currently under-used. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area 	Nelson	Nelson	HG1.41

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 13 candidate sites were submitted in the Nelson ward, of which 1 was below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>If a comparison is made between all sites suitable for further consideration it will be noted that many of the sites represent significant greenfield extension, whereas the Cattle Market site and the Handball Court site are both brownfield sites within settlement limits, It is considered that the provision of housing from these two sites would be sufficient for the settlement of Nelson to build on its existing role and function. The release of greenfield sites, which are likely to be larger in scale, would not only relate poorly to the strategy but would also have a significant impact on landscape and ecology in the area.</p>			
C02	<p>Land east of Hen Berthlwyd</p> <p>The site scored poorly in relation to the Strategy due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area. • The site will not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site is an encroachment into the open countryside. • It would not limit countryside impact as the site has been identified as important in biodiversity terms. 	Nelson	Nelson	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>It is recognised that Nelson is a key settlement and therefore development which reflects the role and function should be promoted. However, there are other sites in the village that are deemed more appropriate for development, namely the two sites with the benefit of a valid planning consent or where a planning application has been submitted (the Cattle Market site and the Handball Court site). It is therefore considered that, in the interests of balancing development across the whole of the County Borough, it would be inappropriate to identify additional greenfield sites over and above these allocations. The site has therefore not been taken forward for further consideration.</p>			
E321	Discussed under C02.	Nelson	Nelson	Not Allocated
E376	<p>Land adjoining Pentwyn Road and Bwl Road</p> <p>The site scored poorly in relation to the Strategy due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area. • The site will not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site is an encroachment into the open countryside. • It would not limit countryside impact as the site has been identified as important in biodiversity terms. <p>It is recognised that Nelson is a key settlement and therefore development which reflects the role and function should be promoted. However, there are other sites in the village that are deemed more appropriate for development, namely the two sites with the benefit of a valid planning consent or where a planning application has been submitted (the Cattle Market site and the Handball Court site). It is therefore considered that, in the interests of balancing development across the whole of the County Borough, it would be inappropriate to identify additional greenfield sites over and above these allocations. In addition, it is considered that Bwl Road and Pentwyn Road form a natural boundary. The site has therefore not been taken forward for further consideration.</p>	Nelson	Nelson	Not Allocated
D39	Land at Graig Rhymney	New Tredegar	New Tredegar	HG1.13

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Part of the site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. This part of the site had planning permission as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of New Tredegar, where residential development will be targeted to help diversify the housing stock given the area's good access to the rail network. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. ▪ It was identified through that the northern part of the candidate site should be retained due to its ecological value. For this reason, the boundary of the site taken forward as an allocation does not include this area of woodland. ▪ The candidate site D39 represents a significant extension of the settlement into the countryside. However, the revised boundary as allocated in the LDP represents a logical extension to the existing settlement pattern and can be seen to be more resource efficient. <p>Comparison with other sites</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Overall, 11 candidate sites were submitted in the New Tredegar ward, of which 3 were below the site size threshold. Only three sites are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given the lack of development opportunities in New Tredegar, which is a result of the topographical and flood risk constraints in the area, it is necessary to bring forward greenfield sites in order to improve the diversity of housing stock in the area. New Tredegar has experienced very little new housing development in recent years, however, this needs to be balanced against the harm that such development may have on the countryside. It is for this reason that this site has been taken forward with a smaller boundary. The fact that this smaller site has been granted planning consent indicates that the principal of development is acceptable of this site and that there is a realistic proposition of it being developed within the plan period.</p>			
D40	<p>Old School Site, Elliott Town</p> <p>Part of the site has been developed as a car park to serve the community facilities. Only part of the site is therefore available for an alternative use and is constrained by the location of the site within a C2 Flood Risk area.</p> <p>It is therefore more appropriate for the site to be located within the settlement boundary rather than allocate for a specific land use.</p>	New Tredegar	New Tredegar	Not Allocated
D141	<p>Land fronting South View Terrace</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	New Tredegar	New Tredegar	HG1.14

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of New Tredegar, where residential development will be targeted to help diversify the housing stock given the area's good access to the rail network. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ There would be no significant harm to the countryside ▪ The site is resource efficient as it lies within existing settlement limits and is surrounded by residential development north and south and a school to the east <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 11 candidate sites were submitted in the New Tredegar ward, of which 3 were below the site size threshold. Only three sites are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given the lack of development opportunities in New Tredegar, which is a result of the topographical and flood risk constraints in the area, it is necessary to bring forward greenfield sites in order to improve the diversity of housing stock as New Tredegar has experienced very little new growth in recent years. This site represents the only realistic development opportunity within the Philipstown part of the New Tredegar ward and therefore, as a means of bringing investment into the area, it represents an appropriate allocation.</p> <p>NOTE – This site is now recommended for removal as a housing allocation</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
1554	<p>Chris Bowen Garage</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent for housing.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Newbridge, which is a Key Settlement. The strategy indicates that housing development would be acceptable as this is an area where there is a need for a greater variety of housing. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as significant it represents a significant development opportunity in a key settlement and would help spread prosperity throughout the County Borough. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the current use of the site is as a garage. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 23 candidate sites were submitted in the Newbridge ward, of which 4 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in Newbridge have been deemed suitable for further consideration The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p>	Newbridge	Newbridge	HG1.49

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Although not submitted through the candidate site process, the site has planning consent and represents a realistic development opportunity as a result of this. Given that the majority of sites available in Newbridge itself are general small in scale, it is considered appropriate to allocate a range of sites including utilising key brownfield sites as appropriate. Chris Bowen Garage, alongside sites 1382, A19 and A21, is an appropriate allocation given that it will help diversify the housing choice in a settlement with few major development opportunities.</p>			
1105/A19	<p>Pennar Lane</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent for housing as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development, but should not be taken forward as an allocation as is likely to be developed before the plan is adopted. However, the phased approach to the site's development has meant that the rate of development has been slower and this position has been re-considered. In the interests of providing certainty on the location of future development, the site has been given further consideration. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Newbridge, which is a Key Settlement. The strategy indicates that housing development would be acceptable as this is an area where there is a need for a greater variety of housing. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would represent an efficient use of land within the NCC ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as although it a settlement extension, it represents a rounding off in an area with little opportunity for new development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. 	Newbridge	Newbridge	HG1.48

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ There was concern regarding the ecological value of the site given that part of the site is a SINC. This issue has, however, been given due consideration through the determination of the planning application ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 23 candidate sites were submitted in the Newbridge ward, of which 4 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in Newbridge have been deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>The site has planning consent and represents a realistic development opportunity as a result of this. Given that the majority of sites available in Newbridge itself are generally small in scale, it is considered appropriate to allocate a range of sites including utilising key brownfield sites as appropriate. Pennar Lane, although not a brownfield site will help diversify the housing stock in this area.</p>			
A21	<p>Land at Fields Park</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The boundary has been amended to remove the eastern part of the site as this part of the site has been developed utilising a different access point. In addition, an area of land adjoining Martins Field has been incorporated into the site boundary to provide certainty on the location for the access into the site.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	Newbridge	Newbridge	HG1.47

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Newbridge, which is a Key Settlement. The strategy indicates that housing development would be acceptable as this is an area where there is a need for a greater variety of housing. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it represents a significant development opportunity in a key settlement and would help spread prosperity throughout the County Borough. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as although it a settlement extension, it represents a rounding off in an area with little opportunity for new development. It relates well to the residential development west and south of the site and lies within existing settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ There was concern regarding the ecological value of the site, where it was identified that the north eastern part of the site was important. ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 23 candidate sites were submitted in the Newbridge ward, of which 4 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in Newbridge have been deemed suitable for further consideration The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Whilst the site is a greenfield extension, it is well related to the settlement and represents an appropriate development opportunity in this strategy area. Given that the majority of sites available in Newbridge itself are generally small in scale, it is considered appropriate to allocate a range of sites including utilising key brownfield sites as appropriate. The site at Fields Park is likely to come forward later in the plan, unlike the nearby greenfield site at Pennar Lane which is already under construction.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
1113/A24	<p>Land at Ty Pwll</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent for housing as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located in the community of Panside, which is a residential area, where the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement would be acceptable. Panside also forms part of the wider Newbridge area. The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Newbridge, which is a Key Settlement. The strategy indicates that housing development would be acceptable as this is an area where there is a need for a greater variety of housing. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would help spread prosperity throughout the County Borough. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ There was concern regarding the ecological value of the site, although this has been considered as part of the planning application to ensure suitable mitigation. ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. ▪ The site does represent a settlement extension beyond the built development limits of Panside into an area of open countryside, although the site is relatively small and does not represent a significant extension. However, the site was within UDP settlement limits and 	Panside	Newbridge	HG1.44

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>was also allocated for housing.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 23 candidate sites were submitted in the Newbridge ward, of which 4 were below the site size threshold. Only two different sites were deemed suitable for further consideration in Panside itself – Ty Pwll and Land West of Old Pant Road. The reasons for the rejection of other sites in the Newbridge ward are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Whilst the site is a greenfield extension, it is a realistic development opportunity given that the site has planning consent. Panside is in need of new housing development to diversify an area characterised by local authority and ex-local authority housing. As there are no appropriate brownfield sites, the release of small-scale greenfield sites is necessary to meet the aims of the strategy. It is considered that, given the lack of past development in the area, the allocation of two relatively small sites – Ty Pwll and Land west of Old Pant Road would be appropriate within the settlement, particularly considering its wider context as part the greater Newbridge area.</p>			
D18	<p>Land north of Ellesmere Court/ Land west of Old Pant Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. At the time of plan preparation, a full planning application was awaiting determination.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located in the community of Panside, which is a residential area, where the provision of additional housing appropriate to the scale of the settlement would be acceptable. Panside also forms part of the wider Newbridge area. The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Newbridge, which is a Key Settlement. 	Panside	Newbridge	HG1.45

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The strategy indicates that housing development would be acceptable as this is an area where there is a need for a greater variety of housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as significant it would help spread prosperity throughout the County Borough. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ There was concern regarding the ecological value of the site, although this has been considered as part of the planning application to ensure suitable mitigation. ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is greenfield. ▪ The site does represent a settlement extension beyond the built development limits of Panside into an area of open countryside, although the site is relatively small and does not represent a significant extension. ▪ <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 23 candidate sites were submitted in the Newbridge ward, of which 4 were below the site size threshold. Only two different sites were deemed suitable for further consideration in Panside itself – Ty Pwll and Land West of Old Pant Road. The reasons for the rejection of other sites in the Newbridge ward are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>Whilst the site is a greenfield extension, it is a realistic development opportunity given that the site has been subject to a planning application. Panside is in need of new housing development to diversify an area characterised by local authority and ex-local authority housing. As there are no appropriate brownfield sites, the release of small-scale greenfield sites is necessary to meet the aims of the strategy. It is considered that, given the lack of past development in the area, the allocation of two relatively small sites – Ty Pwll and Land west of Old Pant Road would be appropriate within the settlement, particularly considering its wider context as part the greater Newbridge area.</p>			
E50	Land at Fields Park Road	Newbridge	Newbridge	See

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	The site is considered under site reference A21.			HG1.47
E293	Land at Old Pant Road The site has been considered under reference D18.	Pantside	Newbridge	See HG1.45
E386	Land at North Celynen The site is considered as most appropriate for its existing use (employment) in light of the recommendations of the Atkins Employment Study, which identified the site as being important in meeting forecast employment needs. The continued protection of the site for employment use is therefore an important part of maintaining a portfolio of employment sites across the County Borough. The site has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.	Newbridge	Newbridge	Not Allocated
A28	Land to the Rear of Oak Terrace Further consideration of the site since the opening of the Oak Terrace bypass indicates that the road is at a much lower level with a steep drop from the site to the road. The shape of the site, the steepness and the fact that it is crossed by a number of drainage channels means that would be difficult to develop in a comprehensive manner. It is therefore not considered appropriate to actively promote this site for residential development.	Pengam	Pengam	Not Allocated
B22	Oak Terrace The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.	Fleur-de-Lys	Pengam	HG1.33

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located within the community of Fleur de Lys, which is a residential area, where the provision of additional housing in-keeping with the scale of the settlement would be acceptable. The site also forms part of the wider Blackwood conurbation ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as significant it would help spread prosperity throughout the County Borough. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The allocation of the site would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site is an appropriate rounding off between the Oak Terrace bypass to the north and residential development ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ The site would exploit brownfield opportunities as was previously a contaminated site used for tipping, but has been reclaimed as part of the Oak Terrace bypass development. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the Pengam ward, of which 5 were below the site size threshold. Only three different sites were deemed suitable for further consideration in the ward, although more detailed consideration has indicated that only the Oak Terrace is suitable. The reasons for the rejection of other sites in the ward are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p>			
D63	<p>Plas Road</p> <p>Due to significant access constraints into the site, it is considered that the site should not be allocated but should remain within the settlement boundary, particularly given that the Oak Terrace site (B22) in close proximity is less constrained and will offer the opportunity for new housing development in this area.</p>	Fleur-de-Lys	Pengam	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
C16	<p>Allotment Garden, Llwyn on Lane</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent for housing as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located within the community of Oakdale, which is a residential area, in the mid valleys conurbation, where residential development will be concentrated. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as significant it would help spread prosperity throughout the County Borough. Furthermore, the allocation of land in Oakdale would complement the employment opportunities on Oakdale Plateau. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The allocation of the site would promote resource efficient settlement patterns, as, although the site is greenfield, it is essentially an infill between new housing developments east and west of the site. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ The site was formerly used as an allotment, which would not fall within the PPW definition of previously developed land. ▪ It is considered that there may be some impact on the countryside due to the presence of hedgerows on the site <p>Comparison with other sites</p>	Oakdale	Penmaen	HG1.27

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the Penmaen ward, of which 6 were below the site size threshold. Only one site was deemed suitable for further consideration for residential use, although the subsequent reassessment of the Brynhoward Terrace site on the basis of new information in respect of access has indicated that initial constraints can be overcome and this site was also suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites in the Penmaen ward are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>It is recognised that Oakdale represents a sustainable location for new development given its proximity to employment opportunities and the Principal Town of Blackwood. However, it should be noted that the area has experienced significant growth in recent years and already has a greater diversity of housing than other settlements in the strategy area. In balancing the level of development it is appropriate to take forward, additional housing allocations to balance the employment growth in the area are desirable. Given that both this site and the Brynhoward Terrace site have developer interest in them, with the former having planning consent at the time of plan preparation, it is considered appropriate to allocate these sites for housing in the LDP.</p>			
D11	<p>Plateau 4</p> <p>The site is considered as most appropriate for its existing use (employment) in light of the recommendations of the Atkins Employment Study, which identified the site as being important in meeting forecast employment needs. The site therefore continues to be promoted for employment use in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Oakdale	Penmaen	Not Allocated
E146	<p>Land off Brynhoward Terrace</p> <p>The original assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site was not suitable for development on access grounds, although this access issue was subsequently resolved and the site was reconsidered as being suitable for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	Oakdale	Penmaen	HG1.26

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located within the community of Oakdale, which is a residential area, in the mid valleys conurbation, where residential development will be concentrated. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as significant it would help spread prosperity throughout the County Borough. Furthermore, the allocation of land in Oakdale would complement the employment opportunities on Oakdale Plateau. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The allocation of the site would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, although the site is greenfield, it is essentially an infill between new housing developments ▪ The site is not considered to conform to the following components: ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield ▪ It is considered that there may be some impact on the countryside due to the presence of hedgerows on the site, although suitable mitigation will be provided as part of the planning application. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 20 candidate sites were submitted in the Penmaen ward, of which 6 were below the site size threshold. Only one site was deemed suitable for further consideration for residential use, although the subsequent reassessment of the Brynhoward Terrace site on the basis of new information means that this site is suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites in the Penmaen ward are set out within Volume 3 of the CSR.</p> <p>It is recognised that Oakdale represents a sustainable location for new development given its proximity to employment opportunities and the Principal Town of Blackwood. However, it should be noted that the area has experienced significant growth in recent years and already has a greater diversity of housing than other settlements in the strategy area. In balancing the level of development it is appropriate to take forward, additional housing allocations to balance the employment growth in the area are desirable. Given that both this site and the Brynhoward Terrace site have developer interest in them, with the former having planning consent at the time of plan</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	preparation, it is considered appropriate to allocate these sites for housing in the LDP.			
1261	<p>Castlegate</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. Indeed, the site was partially under construction as of the base date. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need. The housing allocation forms part of a mixed-use allocation with leisure, community facilities and commercial uses, which ensures growth is balanced at a local level. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and is an appropriate rounding off of Caerphilly within the boundary of the Caerphilly bypass. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site brownfield as it was a former tip, which has since been reclaimed. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. 	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	HG1.73

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated. The allocation of sites with planning consent where they meet the strategy was considered the most appropriate in providing certainty in respect of the location of new development.</p> <p>Castlegate has planning consent and is under construction but, given the scale of development, it is not anticipated that the development would be completed until after the adoption of the plan. The site conforms well to the strategy as a brownfield mixed-use development and is a realistic opportunity that should be reflected as an allocation to provide certainty.</p>			
D64	<p>Ty Nant</p> <p>The site is only 0.39 Ha and the site assessment has identified that the mature trees should be retained. Taking this into account, and the need to relocate the onsite parking provision, the site will fall below the 0.33 Ha threshold and therefore will not be considered for allocation. The site has been left within the settlement boundary to allow it to come forward for a smaller development subject to other material considerations being met in the future.</p>	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Not Allocated
D160	<p>Cwm lfor Primary</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP as mixed use allocation incorporating a replacement school.</p>	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	HG1.75

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need. The housing allocation forms part of a mixed-use allocation, which will facilitate the redevelopment of an existing school. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and is in a central location within the Penyrheol area of Caerphilly. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is brownfield as it is currently a school. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in respect of whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated.</p> <p>Cwm lfor Primary does not have planning consent but is a sustainable brownfield site, which will facilitate the redevelopment of a school. It is the only allocation in the Penyrheol part of the settlement.</p>			
D163	<p>Hendre Infants School</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need. The housing allocation forms part of a mixed-use allocation, which will facilitate the redevelopment of an existing school. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities 	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	HG1.74

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>through appropriate planning obligations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is brownfield as it is currently a school. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in respect of whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated.</p> <p>Hendre Infants does not have planning consent but is a sustainable brownfield site, which will be surplus to requirements upon the consolidation of the infants and junior schools on one site.</p>			
E287	<p>Consortium of land adjacent to Trecenydd Industrial Estate</p> <p>It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Not Allocated
E291	<p>Former railway land, adjoining Trecenydd Industrial Estate</p>	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.			
E292	Land at Treceenydd Industrial Estate It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Not Allocated
F9	Energlyn Sidings Further assessment has indicated that this site would be the most appropriate location for the new Energlyn station, which has been identified in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Not Allocated
D20	Land adjacent to Islwyn Park Site is most suitable for its existing employment use and has been protected accordingly in the Deposit LDP.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Not Allocated
E54	Glanbrynar Farm (South) Tipping on the site as part of the Sirhowy Enterprise Way (SEW) development has meant that the site is now more visually prominent. It is considered that the SEW forms a defensible boundary and development to the north of the road, particularly at this higher level should be resisted. The site has therefore been left outside of the settlement boundary.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Not Allocated
E90	FKI Hawker Works, Newport Rd, Blackwood (Eastern Site) The site is considered most appropriate for its existing use and has been protected for employment in the Deposit LDP.	Blackwood	Pontllanfraith	Not Allocated
E296	Land at Newbridge Road Industrial Estate	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	The site is considered most appropriate for its existing use and has been protected for employment in the Deposit LDP.			
1162	<p>Heol Evan Wynne</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. The number of units remaining reflects the second phase of development. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Pontlottyn, which is a residential area where further residential development will be concentrated as it has good access to the rail network. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. There will be limited impact on the countryside ▪ The site is brownfield as it was formerly a British Legion club. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 12 candidate sites were submitted in the Pontlottyn ward, 1 of which was below the site size threshold. Eight of these sites were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p>	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	HG1.08

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>In determining which sites to take forward, consideration was given to what an appropriate level of growth would be for Pontlottyn. It would not be sustainable to allocate all suitable sites in the settlement as this would not represent a balanced approach to future growth so, in determining which sites were to go forward, the search sequence as set out in the housing MIPPS was, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>There are two brownfield sites (1162 and E393) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, another large site (A26) has the benefit of planning consent and is better related to Pontlottyn shops and station. It is considered that these three sites offer an appropriate range for the village and that there is no need for additional sites to be allocated in the area.</p>			
A26	<p>Land adjacent to Brynglas</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning consent as of 1st April 2007 and therefore represents a realistic development opportunity.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Pontlottyn, which is a residential area where further residential development will be concentrated as it has good access to the rail network. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement 	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	HG1.11

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>limits and is surrounded by residential development and community uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities as it is greenfield <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 12 candidate sites were submitted in the Pontlottyn ward, 1 of which was below the site size threshold. Eight of these sites were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>In determining which sites to take forward, consideration was given to what an appropriate level of growth would be for Pontlottyn. It would not be sustainable to allocate all suitable sites in the settlement as this would not represent a balanced approach to future growth so, in determining which sites were to go forward, the search sequence as set out in the housing MIPPS was, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>There are two brownfield sites (1162 and E393) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, this site (A26) has the benefit of planning consent and is better related to Pontlottyn shops and station. It is considered that these three sites offer an appropriate range for the village and that there is no need for additional sites to be allocated in the area.</p>			
D33	<p>Land adjacent to Brynhyfryd</p> <p>This site scores less well than other sites in Pontlottyn as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site would be regarded as encroachment into the open countryside 	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would not limit countryside impact, as development would result in the loss of some trees and hedgerows and would clearly result in the development of the open countryside. <p>In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, a search sequence should be followed, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>Pontlottyn is identified as an area where limited residential development will be acceptable, particularly as it has good access to the rail network. There are two brownfield sites (1162 and E393) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, another large site (A26) has the benefit of planning consent and is better related to Pontlottyn shops and station. It is considered that these three sites offer an appropriate range for the village and that there is no need for additional sites to be allocated in the area.</p>			
E75	<p>Land at Capital Valley</p> <p>Site is considered most suitable for its existing use and has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Not Allocated
E76	<p>Land at Brynhyfryd</p> <p>This site scores less well than other sites in Pontlottyn as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities. The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site would be regarded as encroachment into the open countryside It would not limit countryside impact, as development would result in the loss of some trees and hedgerows and would clearly result in the development of the open countryside. <p>In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, a search sequence should be followed, starting with the re-use of previously</p>	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>Pontlottyn is identified as an area where limited residential development will be acceptable, particularly as it has good access to the rail network. There are two brownfield sites (1162 and E393) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, another large site (A26) has the benefit of planning consent and is better related to Pontlottyn shops and station. It is considered that these three sites offer an appropriate range for the village and that there is no need for additional sites to be allocated in the area.</p>			
E78	<p>Part of Duffryn Farm</p> <p>Site E78 scores less well than other sites in Pontlottyn as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site would be regarded as encroachment into the open countryside • It would not limit countryside impact, as development would result in the loss of some trees and hedgerows and would clearly result in the development of the open countryside. <p>In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, a search sequence should be followed, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>Pontlottyn is identified as an area where limited residential development will be acceptable, particularly as it has good access to the rail network. There are two brownfield sites (1162 and E393) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, another large site (A26) has the benefit of planning consent and is better related to Pontlottyn shops and station. It is considered that these three sites offer an appropriate range for the village and that there is no need for additional sites to be allocated in the area.</p>	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Not Allocated
E95	Land at the rear of Southend Terrace	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Not

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>In order for the development of the site to be viable due to the significant highways improvements required to ensure an acceptable access can be achieved the site would have to be linked to E260, also incorporating an area of land which was not submitted through the candidate site process which lies between the E95 and E260. However, further consideration has indicated that this would not be acceptable due to the ecological value of the land between the sites. In light of these significant constraints, it is considered more appropriate to allocate other less constrained sites in Pontlottyn.</p>			Allocated
E260	<p>Land adjacent to South End Terrace</p> <p>In order for the development of the site to be viable due to the significant highways improvements required to ensure an acceptable access can be achieved the site would have to be linked to E95, also incorporating an area of land which was not submitted through the candidate site process which lies between the E95 and E260. However, further consideration has indicated that this would not be acceptable due to the ecological value of the land between the sites. In light of these significant constraints, it is considered more appropriate to allocate other less constrained sites in Pontlottyn</p>	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Not Allocated
E393	<p>Former Depot South of Pontlottyn Link Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of the site would allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA. ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Pontlottyn, which is a residential area where further residential development will be concentrated as it has good access to the rail network. 	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	HG1.07

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area that has experienced little new housing development in the past. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, although the site is on the edge of the settlement, it would result in the re-use of previously developed land. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is brownfield as it was formerly as a timber storage depot. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 12 candidate sites were submitted in the Pontlottyn ward, 1 of which was below the site size threshold. Eight of these sites were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>In determining which sites to take forward, consideration was given to what an appropriate level of growth would be for Pontlottyn. It would not be sustainable to allocate all suitable sites in the settlement as this would not represent a balanced approach to future growth so, in determining which sites were to go forward, the search sequence as set out in the housing MIPPS was, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>There are two brownfield sites (1162 and this site) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, site A26 has the benefit of planning consent and is better related to Pontlottyn shops and station. It is considered that these three sites offer an appropriate range for the village and that there is no need for additional sites to be allocated in the area.</p>			
1412	<p>Rom River</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had planning permission as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007,</p>	Risca	Risca East	HG1.56

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Risca-Pontymister as a Principal Town, where new housing should be targeted. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed across the County Borough. The allocation for housing would also compliment Risca's retail and employment function. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site had a former industrial use. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area and is in close proximity to the recently-opened Risca train station. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Risca East and Risca West wards, of which 6 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Risca's role as a Principal Town it is considered necessary to allocate several sites to support the role and function of the area. The town has a number of brownfield opportunities close to the town centre and railway station (this site, Station Approach, Brooklands Road, the eastern part of land adjacent to the River Ebbw, Suflex). In line with the search sequence set out within the Housing MIPPS, previously developed land and building should be utilised first and therefore it is considered appropriate to allocate these suitable brownfield sites, rather than taking forward the greenfield</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	settlement extensions that have also been proposed. The Rom River site already has planning consent and is therefore seen to be a realistic development opportunity.			
1124	<p>Land at Station Approach, Risca.</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Risca-Pontymister as a Principal Town, where new housing should be targeted. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed across the County Borough. The allocation for housing would also compliment Risca's retail and employment function. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site had a former industrial use. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area and is in close proximity to the town centre. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Risca East and Risca West wards, of which 6 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration.</p>	Risca	Risca West	HG1.55

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Risca's role as a Principal Town it is considered necessary to allocate several sites to support the role and function of the area. The town has a number of brownfield opportunities close to the town centre and railway station (this site, Rom River, Brooklands Road, the eastern part of land adjacent to the River Ebbw, Suflex). In line with the search sequence set out within the Housing MIPPS, previously developed land and building should be utilised first and therefore it is considered appropriate to allocate these suitable brownfield sites, rather than taking forward the greenfield settlement extensions that have also been proposed. The Station Approach site already has planning consent and is therefore seen to be a realistic development opportunity.</p>			
A13	<p>Eppynt Close</p> <p>The site also scores poorly in relation to the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site does not promote development opportunities in the Heads of the Valleys (north) part of the County Borough. • It does not exploit brownfield opportunities • It is not considered to reduce the impact on the countryside due to its SINC status • It is not considered to promote resource efficient settlement patterns due to its prominent hillside edge of settlement location. <p>The recent SINC review has identified that the site is still worthy of its identification as a SINC and was highlighted in particular as having the highest recorded number of marbled white butterfly in the local area.</p> <p>It is noted that Risca is identified as a principal town in the Strategy and, as such, development should be targeted to reflect its role and function. However, there are several brownfield sites proposed in Risca, all of which are in more sustainable locations in better proximity to the town centre and railway station. It is therefore considered that there is no need for additional greenfield land to be released.</p>	Risca	Risca East	Not Allocated
D68	Backland area to the rear of Commercial Street	Pontymister	Risca West	Not

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The plan employs a precautionary approach to flood risk, seeking to ensure development avoids the flood plain where possible. Unlike other sites in Risca-Pontymister town centre this site does not have the benefit of planning consent, so, in the interests of flood risk, it is considered that it should not be allocated for a specific use.</p> <p>Given that the site lies within the settlement it is considered most appropriate for the site to remain in the settlement boundary to allow it to come forward for an appropriate use, subject to the an acceptable flood consequences assessment being undertaken.</p>			Allocated
D69	<p>Brooklands Road, Council Service Site</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Risca-Pontymister as a Principal Town, where new housing should be targeted. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed across the County Borough. The allocation for housing would also compliment Risca's retail and employment function. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site had a former library/community use ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area and is in close proximity to the town centre. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. 	Pontymister	Risca West	HG1.57

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Risca East and Risca West wards, of which 6 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Risca's role as a Principal Town it is considered necessary to allocate several sites to support the role and function of the area. The town has a number of brownfield opportunities close to the town centre and railway station (this site, Rom River, Station Approach, the eastern part of land adjacent to the River Ebbw, Suflex). In line with the search sequence set out within the Housing MIPPS, previously developed land and building should be utilised first and therefore it is considered appropriate to allocate these suitable brownfield sites, rather than taking forward the greenfield settlement extensions that have also been proposed.</p> <p>NOTE – This site is now recommended for removal as a housing allocation</p>			
D158	<p>Eastern part of land adjacent to River Ebbw</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, subject to the signing of a Section 106, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Risca-Pontymister as a Principal Town, where new housing should be targeted. 	Risca	Risca West	HG1.58

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed across the County Borough. The LDP identifies the opportunity for new mixed use development on brownfield land adjacent to the River Ebbw. This allocation reflects the housing element of this scheme. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site had a former industrial use. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area and is in close proximity to the town centre. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Risca East and Risca West wards, of which 6 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Risca's role as a Principal Town it is considered necessary to allocate several sites to support the role and function of the area. The town has a number of brownfield opportunities close to the town centre and railway station (this site, Rom River, Brooklands Road, Station Approach, Suflex). In line with the search sequence set out within the Housing MIPPS, previously developed land and building should be utilised first and therefore it is considered appropriate to allocate these suitable brownfield sites, rather than taking forward the greenfield settlement extensions that have also been proposed. This site already has planning consent (subject to Section 106) and is therefore seen to be a realistic development opportunity.</p>			
D159	<p>Suflex Factory</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Risca	Risca West	HG1.58

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but a planning application had been submitted at the time of plan preparation, demonstrating that the site was realistically likely to be developed. The assessment undertaken as part of the planning application indicated that the site was suitable in principle for development. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Risca-Pontymister as a Principal Town, where new housing should be targeted. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures that development is directed across the County Borough. The allocation for housing would also compliment Risca's retail and employment function. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site had a former industrial use. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site within an existing residential area and is in close proximity to the town centre. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 16 candidate sites were submitted in the Risca East and Risca West wards, of which 6 were below the site size threshold. Several sites in the area are deemed suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Risca's role as a Principal Town it is considered necessary to allocate several sites to support the role and function of the area. The town has a number of brownfield opportunities close to the town centre and railway station (this site, Rom River, Brooklands Road, Station Approach, Suflex). In line with the search sequence set out within the Housing MIPPS, previously developed land and</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>building should be utilised first and therefore it is considered appropriate to allocate these suitable brownfield sites, rather than taking forward the greenfield settlement extensions that have also been proposed. This fact that a full planning application has been submitted on the site indicates that it is a realistic development opportunity.</p>			
E355	<p>Land to the west of Fernlea</p> <p>The site scores less well than other sites in the Risca area when assessed again the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located within the north of the County Borough (Heads of the Valleys area). • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns due its extension into the existing boundaries of the settlement into the countryside • It is not considered to limit the impact on the countryside <p>Furthermore, the site is constrained by the need to acquire land in order to gain access. There are brownfield sites within this Principal Town that score better in relation to the Strategy and therefore these have been allocated in preference to this site.</p>	Risca	Risca West	Not Allocated
E360	<p>Land at Danygraig Works</p> <p>The Danygraig area of Risca is located on the opposite site of the bypass to the main centre and therefore is not as well related to the town centre and public transport nodes. Furthermore, the proximity to the bypass may impact on residential amenity due to noise. In light of this, it is considered appropriate to leave within the settlement boundary unallocated to allow the site to come forward in the future if noise issues can be satisfied.</p>	Risca	Risca West	Not Allocated
A27/B05	<p>Tir y Berth</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit along with B05.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of</p>	Hengoed	St Cattwg	HG1.34

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Tiryberth, which is identified in the plan as an area where residential development would be located on the grounds that it has good access to the rail network. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it ensures prosperity is spread across the County Borough. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is currently used for the sale of cars and car parts. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site between two residential developments ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It will not have a harmful impact on the countryside <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 37 candidate sites were submitted in the St Cattwg ward, of which 1 was below the site size threshold. A27 and B05 were the only suitable sites submitted in the Tiryberth area. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given that there are no other available sites in Tiryberth and this represents an appropriate brownfield redevelopment in a sustainable location close to Pengam station and a small supermarket, it is considered appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation. There has been recent new housing development on the brownfield site immediately north of this site, demonstrating that this areawould also be a realistic development opportunity.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
C25	<p>Land at Gwaun Ar Lwyddes Farm</p> <p>The site scores poorly when assessed against the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the north of the County Borough. • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not considered to offer a balanced approach to future growth as it is not identified as an area that is in need of a choice of housing types as there is already a considerable range of dwelling types in the village. New houses should therefore be directed to other areas. • It is not considered that it would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends beyond the clear boundary of the settlement. • Penpedairheol is not identified as a settlement requiring additional housing to support its role and function. • It is not considered that the site would reduce the impact the development upon the countryside as the development would be regarded as an extension into the countryside. <p><i>This area was considered by the Inspector at the UDP Inquiry, who concluded “the land which lies outside this boundary is, due to its open nature, wholly different in character and appearance and the objection site can properly be regarded as part of Penpedairheol’s rural surroundings; this, notwithstanding the presence just to the north and north-east of this site of the Rhos-yr-arfa Farm complex and a large animal feeds premises.</i></p> <p><i>The prospect of development here strengthens my opinion regarding this case. Housing on this site would represent a noticeable expansion of the urban area into this pleasant countryside fringe and cause serious harm to the character and appearance of these surroundings.”</i></p> <p>It is considered that this is position is still valid in the current planning context.</p>	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Not Allocated
D138	<p>Former playground at Cardiff Road</p> <p>Further consideration has identified that the location of a major culvert under this relatively small site would preclude built development on the site.</p>	Glan-y-nant	St Cattwg	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
D165	<p>Greenhill Primary School</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP as mixed use allocation incorporating a replacement school.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Gelligaer, which is identified in the plan as a residential area where limited housing development will be allowed as there is a need for a greater variety of housing. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would help spread prosperity through the County Borough. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits and would be a natural infill between residential development to the north and south. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is brownfield as it is currently a school. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the NCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 37 candidate sites were submitted in the St Cattwg ward, of which 1 was below the site size threshold. However, Greenhill Primary is the only suitable site in Gelligaer. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p>	Gelligaer	St Cattwg	HG1.40

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	Greenhill Primary the only site identified as suitable for further consideration through the candidate site process in this area. It is an appropriate allocation as it is well related to existing development, brownfield and will facilitate the provision of a new school in an area where this is needed.			
E24	<p>Land adjacent to Bryncoed Terrace</p> <p>The site scores poorly when assessed against the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the north of the County Borough. • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not considered to offer a balanced approach to future growth as it is not identified as an area that is in need of a choice of housing types as there is already a considerable range of dwelling types in the village. New houses should therefore be directed to other areas. • It is not considered that it would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends beyond the clear boundary of the settlement. • Penpedairheol is not identified as a settlement requiring additional housing to support its role and function. • It is not considered that the site would reduce the impact the development upon the countryside as the development would be regarded as an extension into the countryside. The site is also constrained by TPOs. 	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Not Allocated
E60	<p>Land off Trosnant Crescent</p> <p>The site scores poorly when assessed against the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the north of the County Borough. • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not considered to offer a balanced approach to future growth as it is not identified as an area that is in need of a choice of housing types as there is already a considerable range of dwelling types in the village. New houses should therefore be directed to other areas. 	Penybryn	St Cattwg	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not considered that it would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends beyond the clear boundary of the settlement. • Penybryn is not identified as a settlement requiring additional housing to support its role and function. • It is not considered that the site would reduce the impact the development upon the countryside as the development would be regarded as an extension into the countryside <p>Whilst the site does adjoin the existing settlement of Penybryn, the irregular shape of the site would mean that on its own it would appear an illogical extension and the only additional land that could be incorporated would be a playing field, which is not considered acceptable. On these grounds, it has not been considered appropriate to take the site forward.</p>			
E79	Land adjacent to Tai'r Heol and Hospital Road Discussed under C25.	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Not Allocated
E82	Land at Gelligaer Court Discussed under C25.	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Not Allocated
E132	Land off Trosnant Crescent Discussed under E60	Penybryn	St Cattwg	Not Allocated
E226	Land adjacent to Carn Gethin Estate Given the ecological value of the site as an important area acting as a wildlife corridor between SINC's, built development was not considered acceptable in this location. However, it was considered that a smaller part may be deemed acceptable for sports or leisure use to allow the site to retain its function as a wildlife corridor. Further consideration has indicated that there is no intention to allocate the site for sports purposes, but it has been designated as a green wedge to prevent coalescence between Penpedairheol and Cefn Hengoed.	Cefn Hengoed	St Cattwg	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
E245	<p>Fields at Tir y Berth Farm</p> <p>Part of the site was identified as suitable for residential use. However, when assessed against the Preferred Strategy the site scored poorly as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the North of the County Borough • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities • It would not limit the impact on the countryside as it is an extension into the countryside • The coalescence of the settlements of Cefn Hengoed and Penpedairheol is not deemed to reflect the role and functions of these settlements as separate communities. 	Cefn Hengoed	St Cattwg	Not Allocated
D01	<p>Cray Paint Works</p> <p>The site is discussed under reference E106.</p>	Waterloo	St James	See HG1.61
D121	<p>Land at Porset Row</p> <p>Site is segregated by the national cycle route and it is therefore considered most appropriate for the existing designation of informal recreation to be retained. Furthermore, the site has been designated as part of a green wedge to prevent coalescence between east Caerphilly and Porset.</p>	Caerphilly	St James	Not Allocated
D162	<p>St James Primary School</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP as mixed use allocation incorporating a replacement school.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p>	Caerphilly	St James	HG1.65

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need. The housing allocation forms part of a mixed-use allocation, which will facilitate the redevelopment of an existing school. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is brownfield as it is currently a school. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated.</p> <p>St James Primary does not have planning consent but is a sustainable brownfield site, which will</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	facilitate the redevelopment of a school.			
E106	<p>Waterloo Works</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Waterloo, which is a residential area in the Caerphilly Basin. The priority and emphasis in the Caerphilly Basin is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as, although the site is large and could be viewed as out of scale with the existing settlement of Waterloo, when Caerphilly Basin is viewed holistically the redevelopment of this significant brownfield site would help address the housing requirements of this area. This site is given specific reference in the plan. ▪ Whilst the site cannot be seen as a natural extension to the existing residential area of Waterloo, the site has always been within settlement limits by virtue of its former use as an employment site. By allocating this significant brownfield site for redevelopment it reduces pressure on greenfield sites in the area. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is brownfield as it was formerly a paint works. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. 	Waterloo	St James	HG1.61

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site assessment raised some ecological concerns due to the presence of EU and UK protected species in the vicinity of the site. However, this issue has been considered as part of the planning application and the appropriate surveys have been submitted. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 12 candidate sites were submitted in the St James ward, where Waterloo is located, 2 of which were below the site size threshold. In the general vicinity of Waterloo itself 3 different sites were submitted, only one of which was taken forward for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>The scale of housing development proposed at Waterloo is significant when compared to the existing settlement. However, there is a need for new housing development within the Southern Connections Corridor and within Caerphilly Basin in particular. The development strategy that underpins the LDP promotes the use of brownfield sites in the first instance in the SCC and the redevelopment of this contaminated site would be beneficial to the whole of the Caerphilly Basin as it will limit the need for greenfield releases. As the site has planning consent (subject to S106), it is likely to be developed irrespective of whether it is allocated but its allocation will ensure certainty.</p>			
A20	<p>Land between Van Road/Maes Glas, and the Railway</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. Part of the site has planning consent for housing subject to Section 106.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, 	Caerphilly	St Martins	HG1.70

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need.. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits. It is in a sustainable location in close proximity to Caerphilly train station. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is brownfield as it is currently occupied by a number of industrial units. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC. ▪ Some concern was raised regarding the value of the small wooded area in the centre of the site. However, this is something that can potentially be mitigated at planning application stage. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in respect of whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated.</p> <p>This site at Van Road has partial consent for housing and is brownfield, in a sustainable location close to the town centre and station. It is considered to be a realistic proposition for development and</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	is therefore an appropriate site to allocate.			
B19	<p>North View Terrace</p> <p>The 2007 Joint Housing Land Availability Study indicated that all units were under construction as of the base date of the study and therefore it is anticipated that all units would be completed before the Deposit Plan is published. The site has therefore not been taken forward as an allocation.</p>	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated
C21	<p>Land at Caerphilly Golfcourse</p> <p>When assessed against the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy, the site scored poorly on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located within the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the whole site is classified as greenfield (The Planning Policy Wales definition of previously developed land excludes parks, recreation grounds and allotments even though they may contain certain urban features such as paths, pavilions or other features. Golf courses, by their nature, would also be excluded from this definition). • It would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns, as built development would be considered as encroachment into the countryside. • The development would not reduce the impact on the countryside as part of the site is Common Land and the western site has been identified as worthy of retention. <p>Whilst it is noted that Caerphilly is a principal town and therefore further development should be promoted in order to reflect the role and function of this settlement, it is important that growth is balanced. Of those sites allocated for housing within the LDP, a high proportion are located within Caerphilly town, although it should be noted that the majority of these sites already have planning consent. Where new sites have been promoted within Caerphilly, sites that conform with a greater number of component parts of the Strategy have been taken forward in preference to this edge of settlement Greenfield extension. There is therefore no further need for additional greenfield land to be released in order to meet housing requirements in the Caerphilly Basin.</p>	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>The Inspector at the UDP Inquiry stated, <i>“this is an extensive area of open land which, to my mind, forms an integral part of the attractive, essentially rural surroundings on the southern side of the town. It is on the lower reaches of Caerphilly Mountain which creates a most impressive backdrop to this settlement and is, I have found, visible from numerous vantage points over a considerable distance. Development here would amount to a significant encroachment of the urban area into this sensitive and prominent stretch of countryside; this would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of these surroundings and seriously damage the setting of this historic town.”</i></p> <p>It is considered that this position remains valid within the current planning context.</p>			
D05	<p>Land at Ness Tar</p> <p>Due to highways constraints associated with the development of the Ness Tar site is considered that development can only come forward if it is linked to the provision of a bypass for South East Caerphilly. The provision of the bypass would result in the release of a substantial area of greenfield land, some of which has been designated a SINCA and a Special Landscape Area. There are therefore significant ecological arguments against the provision of such the road.</p> <p>Whilst the provision of the road has potential benefits of alleviating traffic congestion in Caerphilly town centre and linked air quality issues, there is insufficient evidence at the present time to justify the bypass on these grounds and therefore comprehensive investigation of the sources of the problem, and assessment of the alternative options will need to be undertaken. However it is important to ensure that whilst the necessary investigative work is underway, no development is permitted that could potentially prejudice the future alignment of a bypass. On completion of the work the Council will either seek to confirm the safeguarded route for the development of a bypass or will remove the safeguarded corridor from the Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the allocation of the brownfield element of Ness Tar alone is unlikely to be viable, as access to the site without a bypass would be limited to significantly fewer dwellings than the site has capacity for. Furthermore, the allocation of the site may potentially impact on future development proposals including the bypass should a need be identified in the future. It is therefore considered most appropriate not to proactively allocate the Ness Tar site but to leave it within settlement limits to</p>	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	allow it to come forward should it become viable to do so in the future. NEEDS TO BE COMPARED WITH BEDWAS			
D157	<p>Cardiff Road/Pentrebane Street</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP, along with D06</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but a planning application for a retail scheme with 127 apartments above had been approved subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement at the time of plan preparation, demonstrating that the site was realistically likely to be developed. The assessment undertaken as part of the planning application indicated that the site was suitable in principle for development. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail centre as the scheme forms part of the overall redevelopment of part of the town centre. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is brownfield as it currently forms part of the existing town centre, which is due to be redeveloped. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. 	Caerphilly	St Martins	HG1.69

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated.</p> <p>The Cardiff Road/Pentrebane St site forms part of a wider regeneration initiative to redevelop a significant area of Caerphilly town centre. This scheme conforms well to the strategy, as it will help diversify the retail offer in the Principal Town centre of Caerphilly and will represent an efficient use of land by also accommodating a residential element.</p>			
E144/D06	<p>Caerphilly Miners Hospital</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP, along with D06</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Caerphilly, which is a Principal Town. The priority and emphasis in Caerphilly is to redevelop existing sites and not on the release of substantial new greenfield settlement extensions. 	Caerphilly	St Martins	HG1.72

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth, as it would support Caerphilly's role as a retail and employment area as well as providing affordable housing in the area of greatest need. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as the site lies within existing settlement limits. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The site is primarily brownfield as it is currently a hospital, which will become surplus to requirement upon the opening of the new hospital in Ystrad Mynach. It is recognised that some greenfield land to the south has been incorporated within the boundary of the site but this represent infill development rather than a greenfield extension. ▪ There will be limited impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the SCC. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>Overall, 47 candidate sites were submitted in the four wards that make up Caerphilly, 12 of which were below the site size threshold. A large number of them are considered to be suitable for further consideration. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volumes 3 and 4 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Caerphilly's position as the largest town in Caerphilly and its role and function as a retail and employment area, it is necessary to consider allocating a number of housing sites in the area. In determining which sites go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to conformity with the strategy, most notable in this respect is whether a site is brownfield and also whether a site has planning consent as there are a large number of sites with consent in the Caerphilly Basin that could come forward irrespective of whether they are allocated.</p> <p>The Caerphilly Miners hospital represents an appropriate allocation, as the site is brownfield, well related to the town centre and realistically likely to come forward given that it will be surplus to</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	requirements in 2011. The inclusion of additional under-used land to the south will make the allocation more attractive and would maximise the efficient use of land.			
E254	Ness Tar Plant Discussed under D05	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated
E269	Land south of Westhaven, Watford Road When assessed against the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy, the site scored poorly on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located within the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the whole site is classified as greenfield • It would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns as development as would be considered as encroachment into the open countryside. • The development would not reduce the impact on the countryside as the site is identified as important for biodiversity and would result in the loss of heavy woodland. Whilst it is noted that Caerphilly is a principal town and therefore further development should be promoted in order to reflect the role and function of this settlement, it is important that growth is balanced. Of those sites allocated for housing within the LDP, a high proportion are located within Caerphilly town, although it should be noted that the majority of these sites already have planning consent. Where new sites have been promoted within Caerphilly, sites which conform with a greater number of component parts of the Strategy have been taken forward in preference to this area of land. There is therefore no further need for additional greenfield land to be released in order to meet housing requirements in the Caerphilly Basin.	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated
E270	Land north of Westhaven, Watford Road When assessed against the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy, the site scored poorly on the basis that:	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located within the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the whole site is classified as greenfield • It would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns as development as would be considered as encroachment into the open countryside. • The development would not reduce the impact on the countryside as the site is identified as important for biodiversity and would result in the loss of heavy woodland. <p>Whilst it is noted that Caerphilly is a principal town and therefore further development should be promoted in order to reflect the role and function of this settlement, it is important that growth is balanced. Of those sites allocated for housing within the LDP, a high proportion are located within Caerphilly town, although it should be noted that the majority of these sites already have planning consent. Where new sites have been promoted within Caerphilly, sites which conform with a greater number of component parts of the Strategy have been taken forward in preference to this area of land. There is therefore no further need for additional greenfield land to be released in order to meet housing requirements in the Caerphilly Basin.</p>			
E290	<p>Land at Garran House, Nantgarw Road</p> <p>It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated
E299	<p>Caerphilly Golf Club</p> <p>Discussed under C21.</p>	Caerphilly	St Martins	Not Allocated
A01	<p>Land East of Llechryd Bungalow</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that</p>	Llechryd	Twyn Carno	HG1.02

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Llechryd which is a residential area ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA, particularly benefitting from the recent dualling of the A465 Heads of the Valleys Road. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to existing development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It will exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is currently used as a garage and bus depot. <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>The settlement of Llechryd lies just north of the Key Settlement of Rhymney, which is split across the wards of Moriah and Twyn Carno. Collectively, 26 candidate sites were submitted in Rhymney, although 4 of these were below the site size threshold. In the Llechryd area itself only two sites were submitted, only one of which was suitable. The reason for the rejection of other site is set out within Volume 5 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given the small size of Llechryd it is considered appropriate to only allocate one site to ensure that development is balanced. The land east of Llechryd Bungalow is the only suitable site in the area and conforms well with the plan strategy, as a brownfield redevelopment in close proximity to a Key Settlement. The site will compliment the investment on road improvements in the area.</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
A29	<p>Land to the South of Merthyr Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>When assessed against the component parts of the strategy, it is considered to adhere to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will allow for development in the HOVRA ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Princetown which is a residential area ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing to complement the economic and infrastructural investment taking place within the HOVRA, particularly benefitting from the recent dualling of the A465 Heads of the Valleys Road. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield ▪ There was concern expressed during the candidate site assessment regarding the countryside impact of the development on the grounds that part of the site was designated as a SINC. However, as part of the SINC Review it has been determined that the site no longer meets the criteria to justify its allocation as a SINC. ▪ It may not be seen as promoting resource efficient settlement patterns as it is a significant greenfield extension to the existing settlement, although the A465 forms a clear boundary to development. 	Princetown	Twyn Carno	HG1.01

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Comparison with other sites The settlement of Princetown lies just north of the Key Settlement of Rhymney, which is split across the wards of Moriah and Twyn Carno. Collectively, 26 candidate sites were submitted in Rhymney, although 4 of these were below the site size threshold. In the Princetown area itself only one site (this site) was submitted, which was found to be suitable. The reason for the rejection of other sites in Rhymney is set out within Volumes 3 and 5 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given the small size of Princetown it is considered appropriate to only allocate one site to ensure that development is balanced. This is only suitable site in Princetown, with the principle of development having been established by virtue of its allocation for housing in the UDP. Although it is a greenfield settlement extension, it is a significant development opportunity in the Heads of the Valleys, which would compliment the investment on road improvements in the area and support the wider Rhymney area's role as a Key Settlement.</p>			
D83	<p>Twyn Carno</p> <p>Further consultation has indicated that a culvert runs directly under the site and it is therefore considered that this will significantly limit the developable area. The site is therefore not suitable for further consideration.</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Not Allocated
D152	<p>Former Skinner's garage and adjoining land</p> <p>The site was deemed most suitable employment use at the preferred strategy stage due to the good road links to the Heads of the Valleys and other employment areas. However, it is not deemed necessary to proactively allocate the site for employment use on the grounds that the Atkins Study found that there was sufficient employment land within the County Borough, with land available for employment development in Rhymney already. The site has however been left within the settlement boundary to allow for redevelopment in the future.</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Not Allocated
E326	<p>Land at Carno Old Houses</p> <p>As a result of further consideration, it is not considered that a suitable access to this site could be</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	delivered even as part of a more comprehensive development alongside E328 and E329. Furthermore part of the site lies without zone C of the flood plain where highly vulnerable development such as housing would not be acceptable.			
E328	<p>Land east of Cemetery House</p> <p>As a result of further consideration, it is not considered that a suitable access to this site could be delivered even as part of a more comprehensive development alongside E326 and E329. Furthermore part of the site lies without zone C of the flood plain where highly vulnerable development such as housing would not be acceptable.</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Not Allocated
E329	<p>Land south of Carno Old Houses</p> <p>As a result of further consideration, it is not considered that a suitable access to this site could be delivered even as part of a more comprehensive development alongside E326 and E328. Furthermore part of the site lies without zone C of the flood plain where highly vulnerable development such as housing would not be acceptable.</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Not Allocated
488	<p>Land north east of Llanarth Street</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent as was under construction at the time of plan preparation.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Wattsville, which is a residential area. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would 	Wattsville	Ynysddu	HG1.54

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area which needs a greater diversity of housing and is well served by employment opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it lies within existing settlement limits and is well related to existing development. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>There were no candidate sites submitted in the Wattsville area as part of the candidate site process. This site, which had planning consent and was partially under construction at the time of plan preparation, represents the only major development opportunity in an area constrained by steep topography.</p> <p>Whilst it is a greenfield site in the SCC, which is an area where development has primarily been directed to brownfield sites, it is appropriate to take the allocation forward on the grounds that there are no suitable brownfield alternatives and this site represents a realistic development opportunity given that the first phase of development was under construction at the time of plan preparation.</p>			
D112	<p>Land opposite Ynysddu Hotel</p> <p>The site lies within a C2 Flood Risk zone and therefore highly vulnerable development such as housing should be precluded. As a result of this, the most appropriate use of the site was deemed to be sport and leisure. However, as part of the SINC review the site was identified as worthy of inclusion as part of the River Sirhowy SINC due to its ecological value. It was not therefore deemed appropriate to take forward the site as a leisure allocation.</p>	Ynysddu	Ynysddu	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
E387	<p>Land at Pen-Y-Cwarel Road</p> <p>The site is considered under reference F2</p>	Wyllie	Ynysddu	Not Allocated
F2	<p>Land adjacent to Pen-y-Cwarel Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The boundary has been amended to remove the area identified as most important in ecological terms.</p> <p>The site was not submitted as a candidate site but had planning consent as of 1st April 2007, demonstrating that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and that the site was realistically likely to be developed. In determining whether it would be appropriate to take the site forward as an allocation the site has been assessed against the strategy.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Wyllie, which is a residential area. ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as the allocation of this site would help spread prosperity through the County Borough by providing housing in an area which needs a greater diversity of housing. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it represents an appropriate rounding off of the settlement. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA as the site is located in the SCC ▪ It will not exploit brownfield opportunities as the site is greenfield ▪ The ecological value of part of the site has been recognised. However, the boundary has been amended to exclude part of the area identified as most important. <p>Comparison with other sites</p>	Wyllie	Ynysddu	HG1.53

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Overall 5 sites were submitted as candidate sites in Wyllie, although one of these sites was below the site size threshold. Only two sites – F2 and an extension of the site incorporating significantly more land (E387) were deemed suitable for further consideration. The reason for the rejection of other sites in Wyllie is set out within Volume 5 of the CSR.</p> <p>Wyllie is an area where future housing development would help sustain the community and it is therefore considered appropriate to allocate a site in the area. Land at Pen-y-Cwarel Road was deemed the most appropriate site for allocation but consideration was given as to whether the inclusion of just the F2 site area was justified or whether additional land as identified by the E387 candidate site should also be incorporated. Given the ecological value of the larger site and access constraints in taking forward a larger allocation, it was concluded that the smaller site should be allocated. This smaller site would also be more appropriate to the scale of the existing settlement. Whilst it is a greenfield site in the SCC, which is an area where development has primarily been directed to brownfield sites, it is appropriate to take the allocation forward on the grounds that there are no suitable brownfield alternatives.</p>			
294/ A14	<p>Penallta Colliery</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has planning consent and the first phases of development were under construction as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development, but should not be taken forward as an allocation as is likely to be developed before the plan is adopted. However, the phased approach to the site's development has meant that the rate of development has been slower and this position has been re-considered. In the interests of providing certainty on the location of future development, the site has been given further consideration. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Ystrad 	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	HG1.35

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>Mynach, which is a Principal Town</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would represent an efficient use of land within the NCC and would provide housing to complement Ystrad Mynach's growing role as an employment and service provision centre. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as, although the site would extend the existing settlement of Ystrad Mynach, it maximises the use of a significant brownfield development opportunity, therefore reducing the need for more intrusive greenfield settlement extensions to be brought forward. ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ The development of the site is not anticipated to have an impact on the countryside. ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a former colliery. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. <p>This site represents an appropriate development opportunity on previously developed land in an area with few major development opportunities. The site conforms to the strategy and it considered to be a realistic proposition for development given that the site has planning consent and the first phases are under construction.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites</p> <p>A total of 17 candidate sites were submitted in Ystrad Mynach, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. Only three of the candidate sites proposed for housing were deemed suitable for further consideration for residential use, Penallta Colliery, Penallta Yard and Land at New Road, two of which had the benefit of planning consent and the other was subject to an application for residential development. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 5 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Ystrad Mynach's role as a Principal Town, it is considered that allocation of all three of these sites would be sustainable as, whilst Penallta Colliery has a capacity of over 500 dwellings, the other</p>			

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>two sites are smaller, with capacities of less than 20 dwellings, but will add to the choice and diversity of housing in the area. As all sites are realistic prospects for development given their planning consents and allocations and all conform to the strategy, it is considered appropriate to allocate the three sites.</p>			
B07	<p>Penallta Yard</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site had outline planning consent for housing as of 1st April 2007.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Ystrad Mynach, which is a Principal Town ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would represent an efficient use of land within the NCC and would provide housing to complement Ystrad Mynach's growing role as an employment and service provision centre. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site bordered by residential development ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is a bus depot. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ Some concern has been raised as to the countryside impact due to the presence of mature 	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	HG1.36

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>trees on the site and records of EU and UK protected species in close proximity. However, there will be the opportunity for mitigation as part of any planning application.</p> <p>This site represents an appropriate development opportunity on previously developed land in an area with few major development opportunities. The site conforms to the strategy and it considered to be a realistic proposition for development given that the site has planning consent.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites A total of 17 candidate sites were submitted in Ystrad Mynach, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. Only three of the candidate sites proposed for housing were deemed suitable for further consideration for residential use, Penallta Colliery, Penallta Yard and Land at New Road, two of which had the benefit of planning consent and the other was subject to an application for residential development. The reasons for the rejection of other sites is set out within Volume 5 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Ystrad Mynach's role as a Principal Town, it is considered that allocation of all three of these sites would be sustainable as, whilst Penallta Colliery has a capacity of over 500 dwellings, the other two sites are smaller, with capacities of less than 20 dwellings, but will add to the choice and diversity of housing in the area. As all sites are realistic prospects for development given their planning consents and allocations and all conform to the strategy, it is considered appropriate to allocate the three sites.</p>			
D145	<p>Caerphilly Road Industrial Estate</p> <p>The site has been protected as a secondary employment site in the Deposit LDP where B1, B2, B8 and Sui Generis uses would be permitted.</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Not Allocated
D146	<p>Land north of the Royal Oak</p> <p>Due to the location of the site within a zone C flood risk area it was considered inappropriate to allocate the site for development. It has however been left within settlement limits and could come forward for redevelopment subject to the submission of an acceptable flood consequences</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Not Allocated

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	assessment as well as other material considerations being met.			
E367	<p>Land at New Road</p> <p>The previously developed part of the site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>The assessment as summarised in the CSR indicates that the site is suitable in principle for development. Further consultation, including with infrastructure providers, has also demonstrated that the site is suitable and would meet the criteria for allocating sites as set out within Paragraph 9.2.9 of the housing MIPPS. Where constraints have been identified, these are set out in Appendix 7 of the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>This assessment against the strategy indicated the site met the following component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The allocation of this site for housing would conform to the role and function of Ystrad Mynach, which is a Principal Town ▪ It would promote a balanced approach to future growth as it would represent an efficient use of land within the NCC and would provide housing to complement Ystrad Mynach's growing role as an employment and service provision centre. ▪ It will promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it is an infill site bordered by residential development ▪ The site will contribute to necessary infrastructure improvements and community facilities through appropriate planning obligations. ▪ It would exploit brownfield opportunities, as the site is currently used as a concrete works. <p>The site is not considered to conform to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It will not allow for development opportunities in the HOVRA, as the site is located in the NCC. ▪ Some concern has been raised as to the countryside impact of the candidate site submitted as it included a substantial greenfield area in addition to the concrete works. This part of the site has not been taken forward. ▪ The boundary of the original candidate site would also not be considered to be a resource 	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	HG1.37

Appendix 4

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	LDP Reference
	<p>efficient pattern as it represents a greenfield settlement extension. The amendment of the boundary to exclude the greenfield area means that the site better reflects the pattern of the existing settlement.</p> <p>Comparison with other sites A total of 17 candidate sites were submitted in Ystrad Mynach, although 2 of these were below the site size threshold. Only three of the candidate sites proposed for housing were deemed suitable for further consideration for residential use, Penallta Colliery, Penallta Yard and Land at New Road, two of which had the benefit of planning consent and the other was subject to an application for residential development. The reasons for the rejection of other sites are set out within Volume 5 of the CSR.</p> <p>Given Ystrad Mynach's role as a Principal Town, it is considered that allocation of all three of these sites would be sustainable as, whilst Penallta Colliery has a capacity of over 500 dwellings, the other two sites are smaller, with capacities of less than 20 dwellings, but will add to the choice and diversity of housing in the area. As all sites are realistic prospects for development given their planning consents and allocations and all conform to the strategy, it is considered appropriate to allocate the three sites.</p>			
E375	<p>Units 1-4 Caerphilly Road</p> <p>Discussed under D145</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Not Allocated
E388	<p>Land to the rear of the Royal Oak Public House</p> <p>Discussed under D146</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Not Allocated