

SB03

2 WORKSHOP SESSIONS (LDP Focus Group, Standing Conference, Joint Area Steering Group, and Stakeholder Panel)

2.1 In order to facilitate discussion a briefing paper was sent out to attendees in advance of these workshops. The briefing paper called “ Development of Alternative Strategic Options” can be viewed on the Council’s website, www.caerphilly.gov.uk. A presentation was given at the beginning of each of the sessions outlining the main issues facing the County Borough over the Plan Period.

2.2 The three strategy options considered were:

OPTION A: UDP STRATEGY (Continuation of Existing Trends)

- Consolidate development in the south of the County Borough within existing settlements
- Allow for the redevelopment of large brownfield sites in the south for mixed use development
- Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements
- Continue to promote growth in the Mid Valleys Corridor
- Release of greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor to allow for additional growth
- Allow for development opportunities in the North and in the Aber Valley
- Continue previous growth pattern

OPTION B URBAN CONTAINMENT STRATEGY

- Exploit brownfield opportunities
- Allow for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available
- Reduce impact of development on the countryside
- Reduce the need to find new sites for development to accommodate future growth
- Sustain existing service provision
- Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements

OPTION C SUSTAINABLE GROWTH STRATEGY

- Emphasis on key locations near transport routes
- Target new development to support threatened services
- Expanded settlements
- Potential impact on the countryside
- Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements
- Proactively targeting growth to the Mid Valley and Upper Valley Areas
- Prevent over heating in the Caerphilly Basin
- Development targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements
- Release of greenfield sites to bolster declining settlements

- 2.3 All those taking part were divided into groups and asked to indicate the key Strengths and Weaknesses of each of the component parts of the three options. This analysis exercise was repeated until each group had considered all three options in detail.
- 2.4 Having regard for their analysis, the attendees were then asked to consider and identify which were the most important components in terms of their strength and the least desirable components because of their weakness. This process was so designed to inform the nature of their preferred strategy and / or to indicate whether there were aspects of **more than one strategy option that should be combined** to form a preferred strategy.
- 2.5 The remainder of this report provides the results of these exercises. Firstly, an account of each session is given separately in order to identify areas of consensus and / or disagreement between the various stakeholder groups. Secondly, there is a short summary of the main findings from the public questionnaire regarding the population forecasts. Thirdly, there is a report on the work of the sustainability group whose remit and task is different from that of the other workshops Finally, there is an analysis of the trends in thinking emerging from the group workshops as a whole.
- 2.6 The main trends of debate are drawn out in the conclusion which identifies the main factors that the Preferred Strategy should consider, subject to appropriate SEA/SA analysis. After formalisation, the recommended Preferred Strategy will be presented to Council early next year for approval to be presented to the public for comment via the statutory six week Pre-Deposit consultation period timetabled for April/May 2007 by the Delivery Agreement.

3 WORKSHOP SESSION FINDINGS

- 3.1 There follows a brief overview of the main points highlighted by each group in turn. A combined summary of all groups of the key Strengths and Weaknesses of each of the component parts of the three options is provided in Appendix A. The separate details for each group are available from the relevant meeting minutes to be found on the Council's website, www.caerphilly.gov.uk.

LDP Focus Group

- 3.2 The Focus Group's workshop session created the following responses: They were most strongly supportive of reducing impact of development on the countryside, and also supportive of exploiting brownfield opportunities, of development which would provide necessary infrastructure improvements, and of proactively targeting growth to the Mid Valley and Upper Valley Areas. They were least supportive of continuing the previous growth pattern.

Standing Conference

- 3.3 The Standing Conference workshop session created the following responses: They were strongly in support of development which would provide necessary infrastructure improvements, and of reducing the impact of development on the countryside. They were also supportive of exploiting brownfield opportunities, emphasising development around key transport routes and development to reflect the role and function of individual settlements. They strongly disagreed with release of greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor and with the continuation of the previous growth patterns within the Borough. They also disagreed with potential impact on the countryside targeted to support threatened services and exploiting

brownfield opportunities.

Joint Area Steering Group

- 3.4 The Joint Area Steering Group workshop session created the following responses: They were most strongly supportive of allowing for development opportunities in the North and in the Aber Valley, of exploiting brownfield opportunities, of reducing impact of development on the countryside, of development which would provide necessary infrastructure, and to allow for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available. They most strongly disagreed with the release of greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor to allow for additional growth, with continuing the previous growth pattern, and the potential impact on the countryside.

Stakeholder Panel

- 3.5 The Stakeholder Panel workshop session created the following responses: They were most strongly supportive of developer to provide necessary infrastructure improvement, to allow for development opportunities in the North and Aber Valley, and development targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements. They most strongly disagreed with the continuation of the previous growth strategy, to consolidating development in the south of the County Borough within existing settlements, and to greenfield sites in the mid-valleys corridor to accommodate additional growth.

4 WORKSHOP SESSION - SUSTAINABILITY GROUP

- 4.1 The Sustainability Group has a different remit to the other four management groups (outlined in paragraphs 3.2 to 3.5 respectively). The Sustainability Group's role in the process is to assess the emerging LDP against identified sustainability objectives and recommend changes based upon likely impacts.
- 4.2 Whilst the remit of the Group is to assist in the assessment of the emerging LDP, it was not considered appropriate to undertake a formal assessment of the alternative strategies at the present time. The alternative strategies have been put forward to the other management groups as sets of component parts that, together, result in the stated strategy. The other management groups have been asked to consider these component parts and identify those parts that should be included in the preferred strategy.
- 4.3 It is possible that the strategy, which eventually becomes the council preferred strategy, is a hybrid of components from all three alternative strategies. An assessment of each individual component would be extremely lengthy and could not take account of any benefits or conflicts that may arise from combining various components. Consequently it was decided that the Sustainability Group would consider the strategies as whole entities and not as component parts.

Meeting Procedure

- 4.4 The Group were split into two equal groups to undertake the exercise. Each group was asked to consider each strategy in turn against the 8 topic areas of the Draft Scoping Report (Population and Human Health, Air Pollution, Cultural Heritage and Landscape, Water, Geology and Geomorphology, Biodiversity, Climatic Factors, Material Assets) and identify positive and negative issues relating to each topic area. From the list of issues the group were then asked to identify one key positive impacts and one key negative impact for each topic area. Once all 8 topics had been

completed, the group then moved onto the next strategy until all 3 had been considered.

- 4.5 Once the consideration of the strategies had been completed the groups were asked to consider the three growth options and to provide 2 key positive impacts and two key negative impacts for each growth option.
- 4.6 The results of the workshops (included under paragraph 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 respectively) are intended to provide an indication of potential effects of each of the strategies as a whole, and do not relate specifically to each component part. The results are guidelines to potential effects and should be borne in mind when considering options for the preferred strategy. The results are not intended to be a formal assessment of the strategies (this will be undertaken once the preferred strategy has been agreed by Council).

5 POPULATION GROWTH AND MIGRATION FORECASTS

- 5.1 Responses received via questionnaires from the various LDP strategy consultation workshops indicated a significant level of support towards planning for future growth (58%). There was far less support for a predicted population balance and only 5% of the responses favoured future decline. See Appendix B for the details.
- 5.2 Popular perception indicated population growth as a result of opening up of the E.U and overspill from both Cardiff and Newport. This trend was also supported by the fact that affordability of housing and infrastructure improvements (particularly in the Mid Valleys) would make Caerphilly an ideal location for commuting to Coastline Settlements.

Migration Options: Sustainable Group Outcomes

- 5.3 The Sustainability Group considered the three alternative migration options (i.e. Out-migration, Migration Balance, In-Migration). Again the Group was split into two workshop groups with the remit to consider each of the options and to provide two key positive impacts and two key negative impacts for each option (total of four – or five where an additional impact was considered to be important enough). The results are summarised below.

Sustainability Group Outcomes on Migration Options

	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
Option 1 Out-Migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Less pressure on existing infrastructure ☉ Less development pressure on important areas of landscape/ biodiversity ☉ Reduction in traffic and related external costs ☉ Reduction of impact on Greenfield areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Lack of investment in declining communities ☉ Perpetuate ageing communities and 'cycle of decline' ☉ Less incentive to invest in infrastructure ☉ Loss of skills ☉ Decline, particularly in the north, increased transfer of

		population resulting in greater pressure on other settlements
Option 2 Migration Balance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⦿ Easier to plan ahead – stability of known population ⦿ Allows flexibility within County Borough ⦿ Existing infrastructure is appropriate to certain extent ⦿ Protection of the characters and cultures of individual settlements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⦿ Increased development pressure on certain settlements ⦿ Difficulty managing sustainability and attracting investment ⦿ Lack of investment to improve infrastructure and facilities ⦿ Stagnation of development/population
Option 3 In-Migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⦿ Investment to improve infrastructure and services ⦿ Increased employment opportunity and quality following investment ⦿ Potential increase in investment ⦿ Potential for creating sustainable developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⦿ Potential to destroy character/culture of individual settlements ⦿ Capacity problems, e.g. traffic, pollution ⦿ Greater pressure on infrastructure and landscape ⦿ Potential for dormitory settlements (increased commuting) ⦿ Need to invest before achieving influx of population

6 ANALYSIS

6.1 OPTION A: UDP DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (Continuation of Existing Trends)

Taken together the groups' combined weighted response was as follows: They were most strongly supportive of allowing for development opportunities in the North and in the Aber Valley. They also were supportive of allowing for the redevelopment of large brownfield sites in the south for mixed use development, and development which would provide necessary infrastructure improvements. They were least supportive of continuing the previous growth pattern, releasing greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor, consolidating development in the south of the County Borough within existing settlements and continuing to promote growth in the Mid Valleys Corridor.

Option A: Sustainability Group Outcomes

The following points represent the key impacts (both positive and negative) that are likely to be:

Key (Significant) Positive Impacts	Key (Significant) Negative Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Reduce need for long distance commuting ☉ Support threatened communities ☉ Containment in south protects biodiversity ☉ Potential to resolve infrastructure problems through planning gain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Pressure on existing infrastructure in the south. ☉ Development not backed up by improvements to infrastructure ☉ Result in increased congestion in mid-Valleys and Caerphilly Basin ☉ Loss of greenfield sites in mid-valleys ☉ Potential to encroach on high quality landscapes (especially mid-valley)

Key Themes

The positive impacts are diverse, covering a range of issues relevant to the strategy, but display no theme. The negative impacts, however, revolve around two issues, i.e. the effect on infrastructure and the loss of quality land in the mid-valleys area. Overall these negative issues can be considered to be the most prominent impacts related to this strategy and that the negative impacts are likely to be more concentrated, whilst the positive impacts are likely to be more widespread.

6.2 OPTION B: URBAN CONTAINMENT STRATEGY

Taken together the groups' combined weighted response was as follows: They were most strongly supportive of exploiting brownfield opportunities, reducing impact of development on the countryside, and allowing for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available. They were least supportive of finding new sites for development to accommodate the growth, and development to sustain service provision.

Option B: Sustainability Group Outcomes

The following points represent the key impacts (both positive and negative) that are likely to be:

Key (Significant) Positive Impacts	Key (Significant) Negative Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Protection of Greenfield habitats ☉ Sustain services by locating new development in close proximity ☉ Reduce urban sprawl, protect countryside ☉ Encourages the protection of open space both urban and rural ☉ Maximise use of infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Loss of brownfield land of high ecological value ☉ Does not take account of need ☉ Increased pressure on recreational space (particularly in urban areas) ☉ Doesn't take account of flood plains ☉ Increased urban congestion

Key Themes

Neither the positive, nor the negative impacts display any common themes running within them. However, it is worth noting that there are two sets of potentially conflicting impacts. Firstly the encouragement of the protection of open space (urban and rural) as opposed to the increased pressure on recreational space (urban). Secondly maximising the use of infrastructure as opposed to increasing congestion.

The fact that such opposite impacts are identified indicates that there are aspects of the overall strategy that can potentially have good or bad aspects. The eventual impact will be dependant upon how these factors are implemented.

6.3 OPTION C: SUSTAINABLE GROWTH

Taken together the groups' combined weighted response was as follows. They were most strongly supportive of development which was targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements, and also development which would provide necessary infrastructure. They also were supportive of proactively targeting growth to the Mid Valley and Upper Valley Areas. They were least supportive of expanding settlements and concerned about the potential impact on the countryside.

Option C: Sustainability Group Outcomes

The following points represent the key impacts (both positive and negative) that are likely to be:

Key (Significant) Positive Impacts	Key (Significant) Negative Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Encourage recycling/renewable trends and opportunity for renewable energy ☉ Maintain and reinforce communities ☉ Sustain and enhance character and culture of existing communities ☉ Flexibility to adapt to changing climate ☉ Opportunity to invest in 'sense of place' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Overall impact will be negative unless full package of landuses are provided ☉ Potential loss of 'sense of place', particularly in respect of landscape ☉ Impact upon the countryside ☉ Increase congestion on arterial routes ☉ Pressure on existing services already under strain

Key Themes

Both the positive and negative impacts cover a wide range of impacts. However, the positive impacts are largely based upon sustainable grounds, i.e. community and sustainable living, whilst the negatives are based upon impacts upon services, infrastructure and land. This implies that there is potential for sustainable forms of development under this strategy, but they have significant adverse effects that will need to be addressed. There is one set of contradictory impacts relating to preserving, or losing, the 'sense of place'. This implies that care will need to be given to the details of the strategy to ensure the negative impact does not occur.

7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 The Council's task to adopt a draft preferred strategy for public consultation purposes is a complex and important one. The following findings of the workshop session should assist the Council in this endeavour.

Components most strongly supported

7.2 Taken together, the Groups scored all six of these components significantly higher than the remaining components

- Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements

- Development targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements
- Exploit brownfield opportunities
- Allow for development opportunities in the North and in the Aber Valley
- Reduce impact of development on the countryside
- Allow for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available

Components most strongly opposed

7.3 Taken together, the Groups were less adamant about these components than with those they strongly supported, with the exception of the first bullet point which scored equally highly.

- Continue previous growth pattern
- Release of greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor to allow for additional growth
- Potential impact on the countryside
- Continue to promote growth in the Mid Valleys Corridor
- Consolidate development in the south of the County Borough within existing settlements
- Reduce the need to find new sites for development to accommodate future growth

7.4 In conclusion, therefore, it is proposed that the above components be used to inform and guide the next stage which is to create a preferred LDP strategy subject to appropriate assessment by the SA/SEA process.

7.5 Finally, the responses received from the various LDP strategy consultation workshops via questionnaires regarding the population growth and migration forecasts indicated a significant level of support towards planning for future growth.

8 Next Stage

8.1 The next stage will be to develop the Preferred Strategy for the LDP, and have it approved for the six week formal public consultation stage in April / May 2007. At that point the Candidate Sites will also be made available for scrutiny, from which will be selected those sites that the Council considers are appropriate to deliver the Preferred Strategy.

CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options

OPTION A: CONTINUATION OF UDP DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY All Groups Combined

a) Consolidate development in the south of the county borough within existing settlements	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relates development to infrastructure • Important to consolidate development as before • Protects the environment; prevents overdevelopment & gridlock • Brownfield sites are available here • The market demand is in the South • Meets the known need and reduces brownfield sites • Fewer areas left for development in the south will inevitably lead to development opportunities elsewhere • Provides opportunities for development in the north, rather than if sites in south • The south is an attractive commuting area with good transport links • Availability of brownfield sites • Strong central region to focus on • Protecting the environment • Encourages development further north • Stable population in the south of the CB • Economies of scale, use of brownfield • Supported • Demand exists, but not use greenfield sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental to other strategy areas • Limiting free choice • No real weakness as development is still allowed in appropriate amounts • This will exacerbate the pressure on services in the south • Greater impact on existing infrastructure and services • May result in over-heating in the south • Does not retain 'pull factors' as the south becomes swamped with development • Potentially miss market opportunities elsewhere • A bottom heavy objective that ignores the rest of the borough • Shift of population to the south of the borough • Land pressure, lead to imbalances in other areas • Communities become stagnant, barriers to development • Supporting infrastructure needs to follow / support development that takes place • Will not allow development of new employment / leisure opportunities • Overheating in south • Not achievable, taking people's choice away • Strain on infrastructure, may affect other areas negatively

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages development in the mid and north of the CB • Reduces pressure on greenfield sites • Prevents overheating in Caerphilly Basin and spreads development further north 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restraining development in the south is against market wishes and this may take development outside the CB • There is pressure on existing green areas, exacerbated by the pressure from Cardiff & the M4 corridor and there is insufficient infrastructure and amenity areas to service additional development • No weakness identified
---	--

b) Allow for the redevelopment of large brownfield sites in the south for mixed use development

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids greenfield use • Allows some development without using greenfield land • Remediate and use where appropriate for development land to ease pressure further north • Development will be appropriate for the existing infrastructure • Opportunities to address the problematic brownfield sites • Will enhance otherwise derelict sites • Satisfies current demand • Environmental benefits of using brownfield sites • Recycles land, and avoids use of greenfield • Yes • Prefer development of brownfield sites to green belt • Protecting greenfield sites, reduce commuters • Preserves the green land between communities • Will create balanced communities • Environmental improvements • Supported • Derelict sites reduced • Can enforce mixed use development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could skew development geographically • Potential loss of industrial estates to housing use • If used chiefly for housing development it would increase the journey to work for residents • Will have on the rest of the borough • Some brownfield sites have high ecological value • Cost of redevelopment, and the loss of ecologically important brownfield sites • May result in the loss of important employment sites • High cost of remediation and accessing these sites • Cost of land remediation and health implications on local residents • Cost of reclamation • Land contamination • Community safety issues, empty offices at night • Must have affordable housing as part of housing mix • Could create conflict, south very congested already • Overheating in south, infrastructural pressures • Ensure proper remediation • May destroy some good biologically diverse brownfield sites

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases potential for mixed use development with the integration of employment uses Recycling of land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of land for industrial development Problems could be encountered with remediation works to brownfield sites. In addition, building on brownfield land is not necessarily the most sustainable development option and some sites have regenerated to form an important ecological habitat Lack of infrastructure to support brownfield sites – need to identify ‘key action areas’
--	--

c) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A development surcharge pays for improvements in the wider area An additional gain from development Delivers needed infrastructure This would work well in the south, given the demand for development there Can be used as ‘carrot and stick’ to get what we need from the developers Potential improvement to services there A good aspiration Developer pays – very pigouvian in method Private sector targeted rather than public to provide Helps enhance quality of life and infrastructure It is a ‘must’ No comment More resources to assist regeneration Will provide necessary improvements to reflect developments Benefits locality, could allow for better leisure facilities in Mid Valleys Supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Might overcharge and damage prospects Drives up house prices Small additional cost to purchaser This would work poorly in the north, given there is less demand for development there Competing needs from planning gain – leisure/affordable housing/infrastructure improvements etc. Increased costs – endangering greater development in the south No weakness Still a high cost on the council in terms of maintenance Inflationary costs passed onto the consumer as developer increases house prices to compensate Cost Conflict with existing buildings No comment Planning gain should be ring fenced to the area of development, sites may be too small to generate much gain Infrastructure still might not be able to cope Unequal benefits across borough

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning gain is localised but reduces public expenditure • Can enforce mixed use development • Provide services in the right location • Provides community benefit and forces developers to be more responsible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment • 'Roof Premium' may affect house prices • Loss of land for industrial development • Policies to enforce developer contributions are often unclear and unsubstantiated by evidence • Developer Contributions need to be strictly enforced
---	--

d) Continue to promote growth in the Mid Valleys Corridor

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strength recognised • Counter balance the growth on the M4 Corridor, both housing & employment uses • Maintains communities • Would take pressure of Caerphilly • Mid Valleys are accessible to those in both the north and the south of the borough • Driving development further north where needed • Will relieve pressure on the Caerphilly Basin • Diversifies employment opportunities and brings employment further north • Balances out development in the borough • Increase prosperity • Develop local economy, provision for social housing • Moving development out of Caerphilly Basin • Brings development to centre of the borough, easier to reach from all parts of the CB • Will help to draw development further north • Improved infrastructure • No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Infrastructure is lagging behind development and could get worse • Congestion, pressures on greenfield land may disrupt community cohesiveness & hinder growth strategy for the north • Would put further pressure on the inadequate infrastructure located in the Mid-Valleys. Especially Maesycwmmmer A472 • Loss of Greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys • Risk of over-heating the north • Road infrastructure will suffer in Mid Valleys • Pressure on infrastructure in the Mid Valleys, particularly on an E-W gradient • Environmental impacts • Loss of greenfield, damage to wildlife, poor roads, recent developments have overloaded infrastructure • Congestion • Congestion, no rail link between Ystrad Mynach and Pontllanfraith • Road network can't cope, poor public transport • Transport / infrastructure already a major issue • Overheating, reached its potential

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pulling people north, maintaining communities and facilities, but need local employment • Tackles problem of population decline, relieves stress on southern area of CB • The continuation of a successful strategy • Releases development pressure placed on Caerphilly Basin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about greenfield development, A472 is a weak link which needs dualling • Pressure on infrastructure especially roads • Requires better transport • There is limited land remaining for further development in the Mid-Valleys Corridor and there are highway infrastructure capacity problems • Transferring the problems experienced in Caerphilly Basin further north
---	---

e) Release of greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor to allow for additional growth

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strength recognised • COMMENT - May be needed to maintain growth • No strength recognised • This would support the need for office development in the Mid Valleys West area • Is ok providing that the chosen sites are appropriate – i.e. do not result in loss of habitats, important green space • Amy support the development of brownfield sites • Will depend on the merits of each site • Can bring much needed development into areas that have no brownfield • No strength • None • Only use as last resort following extensive consultation • None • No, only as last resort or as limited infill • None • Could improve infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land a severe weakness • Greenfield loss and coalescence of communities • Environmental damage, loss of landscape & ecology • Dangerous when not planned effectively • Eroding the beauty of the landscape and benefits of green open spaces • Unacceptable further loss of greenfield sites • Will depend on the merits of each site • Lack of infrastructure and services to support growth, as well as the environmental impacts on SSSIs and leisure attractions • Loss of attractive green areas • Loss of greenfield, damage to wildlife, poor roads, recent developments have overloaded infrastructure • Environmental implications • Not many to start with • Opposed to loss of greenfield land and the joining of settlements, destroys scenery / attraction • Very few greenfield sites still available, need greenfield spaces

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield land could be considered for community facilities, use planning system for ecological benefit • Putting development where it is demanded • Plentiful, much of lower ecological value • Use of appropriate sites subject to prioritisation, permitting development whereby community benefit can be demonstrated • No strength identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of irreplaceable resource • Concern about greenfield development, give brownfield sites priority • Reduces green spaces • Requires better transport • Potential to overload infrastructure and the loss of biodiversity & open space • Impact on the environment and countryside
---	--

f) Allow for development opportunities in the North and in the Aber Valley

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strength recognised • Strengthen existing communities • Pursue further appropriate development where possible and related to existing communities • Would encourage inward migration and arrest decline • Links in with the investment in the Heads of the Valleys initiative • Potential development supporting deprived communities in the north • Is good support i.e. the New Tredegar example • Addresses the needs in these areas • Regeneration of areas in greatest need • Allowing regeneration of deprived communities • Regeneration • If supported by the development of employment opportunities, small businesses • Development will help tackle problems / social needs etc • May offer good benefits in terms of planning gain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not proactive enough • Infrastructure inadequate to deliver opportunities, more proactive efforts required, desired changes not yet achieved • Not sufficiently proactive • No weakness • May lead to greater out-migration • Doesn't allow for a strategic approach • No weakness • Needs a more pro-active approach – not just accept anything • This do not actively encourage the regeneration of these areas enough • Terrain, road infrastructure • Space constriction for redevelopment • Local people often can't afford private housing on new developments • Provided infrastructure is there to support it • Would be difficult to plan a mix of types of development

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regeneration & improvement in facilities • No comment • Help sustain communities in north • Link to Heads of the Valleys initiative, especially funding from WAG, sustain existing communities • Stimulates growth in deprived areas and presents the opportunity to improve infrastructure • Developing weak areas through regeneration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be unsuccessful • Not strong enough, growth needs to be promoted • Not focused on north or actively encouraged • Road links poor • Could adversely effect community culture • Encouraging people to re-locate to theses areas
<p>g) Continue previous growth pattern</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strength</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None – not appropriate • COMMENT – Agree with policy • No strength recognised • The UDP has been successful • Easy option! • No strength identified • Has been successful in the past – i.e. in Caerphilly • It has ‘done the job’ up until now • No comment • Brings prosperity to north, still room for growth in the south • Reflects natural patterns • No comment • No comment • Means that we are in control for the benefit of our communities • No comment 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Weakness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn’t take advantage of new opportunities • Doesn’t address new opportunities and difficulties • Loss of greenfield land; communities being swamped • Over-concentration of development in the Caerphilly Basin and Mid-Valleys • Some communities would have too much growth – i.e. Caerphilly Basin, and others too little – i.e. the North • Would be outdated and not reflecting the needs of today • Is a laissez-faire approach. Intervention is needed to change growth patterns • Ignores new opportunities and needs to grow • No comment • Not in mid valleys because of services • Unpredictability • No comment • Too much being built in south of CB at present • May lose out on worthwhile development

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment • A given known • Builds on existing services, maximise market growth • Potential for inward investment and funding • No strength identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy outdated • Need to share prosperity, spread growth outwards • Don't know if it will fit in the future • Increases risk of overheating • Poor infrastructure and the potential for stagnating communities that are in need of regeneration • The previous growth strategy is outdated
---	--

Any Additional Comments:

Need to consider most appropriate size and types of dwellings and industrial units

Greater willingness to move north because of infrastructure improvements & house prices

The continuation of the UDP Strategy is not an option and needs refreshing as it is outdated

CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options

OPTION B: URBAN CONTAINMENT STRATEGY

All Groups Combined

a) Exploit brownfield opportunities	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remediation, regeneration & protection of the environment • Regeneration of unkempt derelict land and improving the environment • Re-use / remediation of brownfield land; protection of greenfield sites • Protects the countryside and green spaces • Minimise impact on greenfield • Helps clean up the environment, is close to existing infrastructure and is a resourceful use of land • Preserves the natural environment • Environmental pressures reduced • Preserves greenfield sites • Conserve greenfield • Quality of sites • Protect greenfield sites and make area more visually appealing • Especially in the north and the Rhymney area, gets rid of blots on the landscape and associated problems, want leisure developments etc as well as housing • Keep green spaces & countryside, more scope if using brownfield sites • Environmental improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations in terms of locations for development • No control over location of brownfield sites • Location predetermined by history • More brownfield sites in the south, this will put pressure on services there • Concentration of brownfield sites in the south • These sites are concentrated in the south, and their redevelopment could result in the loss of some historically/architecturally significant sites • Potential loss of employment land for housing • Majority of brownfield sites are skewed in the south • Brownfield sites located in the south, fewer in mid-valleys and the north • Location • Cost, realism and informed consultation, fully aware of implications • Careful about what's in the ground • Would miss out on development further north, gridlock in south, loss of historic / old landmark buildings, expense of site remediation and the impact on house prices • Development will still be concentrated in the south • Increase traffic issues near brownfield sites

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean up old industrial sites close to existing settlements, consult on future use, help to protect greenfield sites • Saves greenfield sites • General acceptability with local population to put land to good use • The re-use of previously developed land • Developing where infrastructure is likely to exist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tendency to use for housing, cost of remediation, proper treatment required • Over development, lose ecologically developed sites • Cost of remediation, the north / south spread is skewed • The potential for overdevelopment and that a significant proportion of this land is within a flood risk area. • May lead to overheating where facilities do not exist
<p>b) Allow for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strength</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds flexibility to bring forward brownfield sites • Maximises the sustainability and regenerative opportunities of brownfield sites • Increases viability of marginal brownfield sites • Will restrict development from inappropriate locations • Costs are reduced for reclamation • These sites are close to existing infrastructure • More likely to preserve green-field elsewhere • Considers brownfield before Greenfield • In support of • Recycling used land • Utilise what we have • Protect greenfield sites and make area more visually appealing • Especially in the north and the Rhymney area, gets rid of blots on the landscape and associated problems, want leisure developments etc as well as housing • Can pick & choose type of development that takes place 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Weakness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exacerbates the problem of location; disparity between north and south • Targeting greenfield land by default • Set precedence for releasing additional greenfield land for all brownfield sites • Very restrictive geographically: N/S divide • Could leave some areas of contaminated land • Could put a strain on the existing infrastructure in the south • Could exclude areas without brownfield land • The location of available sites then dictates the strategy • Brownfield sites are skewed to the south • Cost of reclamation • Cost, decontamination • Careful about what's in the ground • Would miss out on development further north, gridlock in south, loss of historic / old landmark buildings, expense of site remediation and the impact on house prices • Will lose containment of areas & may adversely affect communities

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects greenfield sites • Integrate old and new, protect greenfield, support Caerphilly economy • Available, may reduce polluted sites • Better balanced development, larger sites available can provide service needs – education, leisure • Improve the visual appearance of derelict land and regenerate derelict buildings within urban areas • More Sustainable use of land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not necessarily, infrastructure / additional services would be required, would force development to the south • Depend on nature of industry, pressure on existing facilities, reinforces divide across Borough • Restricted to south • The past determining the future, restrictive • This component is subject to viability – there are less brownfield opportunities further north • Reduce opportunity for development further north as there is less brownfield land available
---	--

c) Reduce impact of development on the countryside

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of landscape & biodiversity • Reduces the need for greenfield development • Protect countryside • Could allow for appropriate development in the countryside such as Tourism • Statement is a positive in itself • Maintaining green spaces/recreational opportunities as well as wildlife • Economic reasons – may prevent tourism opportunities • Maintains the countryside, and accords with public perceptions • Preserves environmental attractiveness • Preservation of wildlife, quality of life • Worth keeping countryside to attract people, business, tourism • Impact on tourism • Maintains ‘greenbelt’ / attraction of area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overly limiting / creates limitations • Contrary to the aim of allowing growth to support viability of communities • Stifles development for villages that need it to keep them viable • Could deflect development away from rural communities that need investment • Limits development opportunities • There are less brownfield sites in north, therefore less opportunities for development • Restricting the supply of land pushes housing prices up • Site availability would dictate the strategy – a backwards approach • Not enough reduction of impact in the north, as the strategy doesn’t focussed on the north enough • Could increase commuting • High social, economic and environmental costs of not doing so • None

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep green spaces & countryside, more scope if using brownfield sites • More people accessing countryside • Support in principle • Keeps countryside intact • Minimises usage of greenfield sites • Can be beneficial if properly targeted • Reduce environmental impact on the countryside and could potentially increase tourism opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is no brownfield land, need to carefully consider – otherwise there would be population decline and loss of shops, services etc • May restrict necessary development in some communities i.e. the north • Overuse of countryside, need for management • Rural development could be about improving services for all • Smaller communities cannot expand, will become more isolated • The north / south spread is skewed, restrictive for future • Setting precedents upon building on countryside • May lead to increased development pressure on small rural hamlets
--	---

d) Reduce the need to find new sites for development to accommodate future growth

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting development at existing infrastructure • Known sites provides certainty and feel good factor • Protecting countryside and efficient use of land • Could be less controversial in the eyes of the public • Brownfield sites exist • Less impact on countryside Greenfield sites, and quicker implementation of sites • Protects greenfield land • Concentrates development opportunities • In support of • Conservation of greenfield and rural areas • Infrastructure present • No comment • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No weakness recognised • Limits the choice and availability of sites • Reduce flexibility to target development to sustain villages • Strain on existing services if development restricted • Fixed locations for development • Will result in concentrating development in the south of the borough where the available sites are • Could put private sector off, and may not deliver a sufficient range of housing • Constraining natural growth • May not be in areas where development is needed • Overcrowding of housing • Is it where we want it? • Nothing would ever happen, risk of too high a density of development

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the reuse of existing land & buildings • Less contentious for residents losing green space and identity • Easier to plan, have enough brownfield sites to meet aims, encourage growth elsewhere • We know what is available • Preserves existing greenfield sites • No strength identified • Potential to stop urban sprawl and maintain the identity of communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power / money of developers puts pressure on development of new areas • May not be as much funding available for new businesses i.e. grants • Villages suffering from out-migration not being allowed development to retain residents • Need improved transport infrastructure • Limits growth, infrastructure may be insufficient • Reduces opportunities to develop – does the population want to live there? • Impractical as it lacks flexibility • Cannot be applied borough wide as there is a need for new sites in certain areas to foster regeneration
--	--

e) Sustain existing service provision

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strength</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COMMENT - Provides opportunity to co-ordinate and improve upon provision into existing settlements • Makes use of existing services – less need to create new • Targets development towards existing provision • Safeguarding existing services in settlements that would otherwise not be targeted • Some brownfield sites may have the infrastructure • Access to services – re-energising existing services • Infrastructure more likely to be improved if services are running effectively • Secures what already exists for communities • Is a focussed approach • None • Save resources 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Weakness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't fit population growth strategy & link in with potential changes • Brownfield development could limit opportunities for planning gain • Need to create provision based on need • The plan should not just be about sustaining, but improving and making better • Brownfield sites do not have the infrastructure/ or services • Impact of redevelopment on existing provision (office accommodation) • Existing services might not be able to accommodate new development • Could work against diversity if too much emphasis is placed on existing sites/centres • Lack of equity across the borough • No growth in service development, need to improve
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better than decline • Improve and at least sustain, but don't want to create too much pressure on existing services • Reduces need to travel & sustains community as a whole • Continuation / expansion of existing services • Needs to be taken into account – sustain and improve education, health, leisure • Not losing any provision • Potential to preserve / improve existing services in areas currently declining in population • Continuation of existing levels of infrastructure • Maintenance and improvement of existing service provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are they up to scratch, apathy • Not as good as improvement • Creates crowded conditions / affects quality of life • Need to encourage more & better services for communities • Existing services may not have capacity • No comment • No growth or expansion, things stay as they are • Pressure on all existing services, pressures will be varied across services • Need for additional services • Existing service provision may be poor and therefore there may be a need for additional services or the up-grading / replacement of existing services
--	--

f) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joins infrastructure with development • Exploiting planning gain opportunities • Reduces impact on existing residents • Shifts the responsibility for providing facilities and infrastructure to the developers • This would work well in the south, given the demand for development there • Might finance improvements in the south and avoid 'bottlenecking' • Seems logical • Is a strength in itself • In support of • Improve standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undermine viability • Doesn't maximise the amount of funding that can be secured via planning gain • Adverse effect on viability • This will only happen where the demand is there for development such as in the south • This would work poorly in the north, given there is less demand for development there • Concentration is south, so no provision in the north • Danger of being an inconsistent approach between areas – no collaboration/strategy for development of infrastructure • May not be flexible enough towards market opportunities. Needs to be balanced to keep developers interest • Inflationary pressures on house prices

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated development meeting needs of residents • No comment • Makes communities / places stronger and provides new facilities • Consolidates the community • Finance to solve existing problems – drainage, roads etc • Development should contribute to quality to life, must link education system to future pattern • Developers contribute to improvements which saves public purse • Improvement in a wider area, encourage development in Mid and Upper Valleys • Provide services in the right location • Necessary infrastructure improvements would not put a strain on existing infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing still • Isolation, unhappy citizens • No comment • Can create difficulties while infrastructure being built, may not be able to make necessary improvements • Will depend on infrastructure that is being offered & what is actually needed • Might find it difficult to get developers to invest / increase house prices • Economic pressures on developers • Cost on housing prices, improvements are locally based • Focuses on one area would be to the detriment of other areas • Policies to enforce developer contributions are often unclear and unsubstantiated by evidence • Could potentially deter development in areas where it is most needed, such as areas of decline and out-migration
--	--

Any Additional Comments:

(d) Is a consequence of the strategy - limit innovation / opportunities

This Option could allow for the wholesale redevelopment of targeted action areas

(e) Should also read “and improve”

Transport issues

Extra costs for brownfield sites e.g. stabilisation, even development for Option B

CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options

OPTION C: SUSTAINABLE GROWTH STRATEGY

All Groups Combined

a) Emphasis on key locations near transport routes	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help integrated transport & public transport growth, more sustainable & choice for people without cars • Public transport gives choice to people • Access to Cardiff / Newport especially by rail and public transport • Infrastructure already existing in these locations • Supports transport hubs • Prioritising need for improved transport, and access to service centres • Provides opportunities to enhance existing public/private transport systems • Creates critical mass of development to influence public transport provision • Maintains accessibility • Helps commuting, preserves green areas • Good, essential for access for residents and business • Allows easy access to employment opportunities • Serving people better in terms of travel to work, takes cars off the road • Transport route already there & planned, economic benefits • A chance of sustaining communities in the north • Supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental impact? • Depends on how reliable and extensive public transport is • Public transport not very strong in some areas – roads are congested • Could further marginalise isolated communities • Results in ribbon development • Reduces opportunities to use brownfield sites in the south • Geography makes east-west travel difficult • Transport must be improved where development takes place • Depends on having good public transport links • No weakness identified • Land availability, doesn't cover areas with poor transport links, poor public transport • Congestion and environmental issue • Congestion • Not enough integration of public transport • Communities without good transport routes will miss out • Could encroach on countryside, subsidies needed to develop transport • Pressure on existing congested roads, excludes locations without good transport links

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce damage to environment using existing transport routes • Potential of opening up areas in need of regeneration • Promotes sustainability • Promotes sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport routes may not be good enough, it's limited in scope • Potential to increase congestion in certain areas • Is likely to result in only a marginal increase in the use of public transport • Could potentially affect development in areas that currently have poor infrastructure and may impede upon declining areas that are in need of regeneration
--	---

b) Target new development to support threatened services

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better geographical balance of development • Help maintain services • Maintains viability of settlements • Maintaining communities that would otherwise decline • No strength • This objective is a strength in itself • New development will provide employment opportunities • Can develop communities' spirit • Balanced approach to planned services • None • Better use of existing infrastructure • Avoiding degeneration • Helps to keep more isolated areas thriving • Help to support what is already in the area • Opportunity to sustain isolated communities • Supported, lots of social capital tied up in existing services • Maintaining employment opportunities, providing services, opportunity to dictate where development goes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievable? – a bit utopian • Might weaken other areas? • Depends on private sector / market • Could displace threat of service losses to other areas • Services are there to support communities not the other way around • Development costs greater and is less attractive to businesses • Focussing development around services will not cater for the influx in population in other areas • This objective is purely re-active to threatened services and does not work to an over-all strategy • Freedom of choice for sites - no coherent strategy • Services are already under threat, shortage of skilled workers • Would it be in the right place and at the right time? • May take money away from other areas, not good if development were to be on greenfield sites • May need to use greenfield sites, developers might not be as willing to invest • Need to provide more / better facilities to encourage people to more in or stay • Services may no longer be required, people may not want to

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables existing communities to survive • Allows flexibility • Protects existing facilities / services 	<p>live there</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment • Services should follow the people • None • Is likely to be unrealistic • No weakness identified
<p>c) Expanded settlements</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strength</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If targeted to appropriate areas • Support viability of all settlements • Appropriate in certain cases; could counter aging populations in some areas • Would create economies of scale • Brings about an improvement in services • Regeneration of failing communities/providing additional support and services • Will help to improve services and promotes travelling less distances to find services and employment • Supports and sustains existing services • In support of • Helps support the community • Building on existing communities • Avoiding degeneration • As last resort to support services, allow controlled expansion • May encourage people to stay rather than out-migrate • Strengthen community • Less of an issue 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Weakness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too blanket – needs to be targeted – phased process? • Deflects development from less popular areas; impact on greenfield; if settlements merge they lose identity • Infrastructure pressures; and if on greenfield site – environmental damage • May result in the loss of many communities distinctiveness and the coalescence of settlements • Pressure in already built up areas • Negative impact on countryside and culture of small communities • Will undermine the intrinsic character of the existing communities • Will put an additional strain on existing infrastructure • Will result in urban sprawl • Lack of affordable housing, types of housing, level of / increase in parking • Take away character of existing development • Need to provide services & infrastructure to support housing development, duty on Council to provide infrastructure to sustain development • Loss of greenfield areas possible

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain viable communities • Expanding smaller settlements may be more sustainable and bring better services • Greater number of community facilities decided locally • Provision of new facilities / services by means of developer contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this is allowed where will it end? • Doesn't necessarily foster community spirit / culture, existing facilities overstretched, needs community facility / focal point • Danger of settlements expanding too much • Using greenfield sites • Threaten greenfield sites and individuality of each community • Could potentially result in the coalescence of settlements and the loss of identity • Impact on the environment and countryside
--	--

d) Potential impact on the countryside

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be minimised if on sustainable development principles • Tourism and planning gain to increase healthy recreational facilities • Tourism development – its design important • Could strengthen communities by using the countryside sensitively – i.e. provide access to it • Direct development to deprived areas • Potential use of planning gain to improve access to the countryside • More vibrant economy if countryside is utilised effectively – i.e. tourism development • More flexible for growth opportunities • Possibility for less of a negative environmental impacts • None • Minimise impact on countryside • Eco friendly housing should be only type allowed, for example • As last resort to support services, allow controlled expansion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to environment & wildlife • Negative environmental impact • Environmental damage • Loss of green spaces and the countryside for future generations, and its tourism potential • Loss of countryside adjacent to housing • Loss of countryside with use of greenfield sites • This objective implies greenfield development • Brownfield vs greenfield issues • Potential environmental impacts • Possible impact on the environment • Limit development • Once it's gone, it's gone • Loss of greenfield areas possible • If development is continually allowed there won't be any countryside • Expanding into countryside, no green wedges between

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could regenerate former industrial sites, must be sympathetic • Encourage greater appreciation of the countryside • Countryside valued but not sacrosanct, housing choice • Open up countryside for residents and tourists • None • No strength identified • No strength identified 	<p>communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be last resort • Reduction of green spaces, effects on farmers • Environmentally it could be a disaster • Impact upon the countryside with the loss of habitats and leisure amenity • Impact on the environment and countryside
---	---

e) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide affordable housing, infrastructure and development in step • Exploiting planning gain • Need more emphasis on basic infrastructure – lack of other funding for it • Can be used as ‘carrot and stick’ to get developers to provide necessary infrastructure and services • Proven track record of working • Improved transport/infrastructure needed • This should always be aspired to • Targets developer’s cash at areas that need it • Its good to have private sector investment – ‘buy in’ • Planning gain for infrastructure • Where needed and not overloading • Can’t develop without infrastructure provides opportunity • Gain an outcome, facilitate development • Planning gain will benefit the local community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undermines viability of some development • Infrastructure investment spread over a wide area • Increase house prices – WAG may reduce its support • Areas with lesser demand lose out • Provision of infrastructure covered by economics • Impact of this on the countryside • Danger of alienating locals • Wont be able to use this principle in the less desirable areas of the borough where demand is lower • Inflationary costs impinged on housing as a result of increased developer costs • Not always / rarely maximised • Would it be where needed? • Possible impact on the environment • May put developers off if too expensive • Needs to be large scale development before planning gain applies

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to improve existing infrastructure • Supported, must be in place before planning permission • Necessary • Improvement desirable • Provide services in the right location • Co-ordinated infrastructure improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some areas wouldn't benefit from infrastructure improvements – not enough investment • Where will finance come from? • Cost & reduction of green spaces • Won't deliver as much as increasing population in Caerphilly Basin • Policies to enforce developer contributions are often unclear and unsubstantiated by evidence. • Existing capacity and availability of land does not allow for improvement
--	--

f) Proactively targeting growth to the Mid Valley and Upper Valley Areas

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regeneration • Eases pressure on high demand areas • Boost Upper Valley area • Would counter-act out-migration and take full of advantage of the investment going into the Heads of the Valleys • These areas are most in need of investment • Regeneration of remote/isolated communities – reduces the risk of overheating in the south • Opportunities to re-shape communities as opposed to growth • Continued support for upper and mid valleys needed • Encourages regeneration • Sustain local communities in the Upper Rhymney Valley • More room for development and regenerating areas including housing stock • Keeping people in the area & giving them power • Improve regeneration of the north • Will encourage good housing mix & services in north of CB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of suitable sites? Market may not deliver • Longer & additional commuting journeys (to Cardiff) • Lower Islwyn also needs a boost (falling school role numbers) – Mid Valleys area filling up? • Would exclude further development in the south • People may not want to move there. Could be wasting our time • Potentially over-heating the mid valleys • No weakness identified • Doesn't relate to market opportunities in the south • Need to maintain other areas as well • Mid valleys already developed • Environmental concerns, cost • Potential impact on greenfield sites if there were no infrastructure in support • Concern regarding greenfield land and site availability in north • Controlled & influenced by developers 'demand'

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit Upper Rhymney Valley & north of the borough, reduce issues in the south • Keep Bargoed alive, people already commuting • Regeneration of most deprived areas, take account of the Heads of the Valleys initiative & monitor it closely to see benefits • Prevents over heating in Caerphilly Basin • Increasing equality and spreading prosperity further north • Increasing equality throughout the borough and targeting more deprived areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid Valleys overheating? • Concerns about practicality, about self-build development, buildings need to inspected • Missing opportunities if we don't regenerate the most deprived areas • Doesn't cut across everyone's needs • Increase in congestion due to longer commuting journeys • There are fewer brownfield sites further north therefore development would more likely on greenfield sites
---	--

g) Prevent over heating in the Caerphilly Basin

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect environment • Take pressure off land in the Basin • Quality of life; infrastructure capacity • Would help to prevent over-stretching of infrastructure and services • Strategy must prevent this • Much needed • Caerphilly can be utilised as a catalyst for growth elsewhere • Is a strength in itself • This is a more balanced approach • Increase the movement of prosperity • Preventing sprawl and congestion • Preventing further congestion • Gets development to go to places where needed • Forcing more development in north, getting away from the M4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits market growth & link to Cardiff • Forcing people to go further north – limiting choice • Less roof tax • Would adversely affect house prices • Stifling natural growth/demand • Commercial sector may not buy into it • Potential for this to become too drastic and development prevented completely in the Caerphilly Basin • Danger that discouraging developers from the south will result in them going elsewhere – i.e. other boroughs • May not be what the market wants • Moving problem families into Mid Valleys and Upper Rhymney Valley, poor transport links, still add to problems of travel through the Caerphilly Basin • Limiting natural growth • Outflow of money to Cardiff etc as shops not available in

<p>corridor mentality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving population further north – regeneration • Supported by some • Improving environment in Caerphilly Basin • Preserves the status quo if growth is sustainable • Prevents overheating in Caerphilly Basin where infrastructure is at capacity and spreads development further north • Could potentially ease congestion within the Caerphilly Basin and spread development further north 	<p>Caerphilly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • Brownfield land available for development • Miss opportunity to develop brownfield, young people in Caerphilly Basin priced out of local market • Considered unrealistic by others • Caerphilly is area of demand at present but this may change • Growth might not be sustainable • Increases pressure on Greenfield sites in the mid-valleys corridor • No weakness identified
<p>h) Development targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strength</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows flexibility – very positive – positive future for whole borough • Balanced approach across the borough and viability of communities • Helps sustain communities; deliver each area’s individual character • Enhances the distinctiveness of each community • Recognising and reinforcing settlements and their role • Balance of services across communities – must involve communities as to what the function of each settlement is • Supports distinction between settlements • An analysis of roles would help to deliver the strategy • In support of • Should enhance and improve standard of communities • Maintain identity 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Weakness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big brother approach? • Difficult to implement / fine tune; too restrictive – look at wider sub regional needs • Nimbyism? • Will focus on what is already in the community, not necessarily what is required there to make them function better • There may be problems defining / measuring the role of settlements • Potential to reduce easy access to some service due to travel issues (perceived and real) • May be difficult to get people to engage in an altruistic way • Must focus around future role, rather current role • Too good to be true – Utopian? • To ensure you have it right otherwise could be catastrophic • Are all the settlements viable to exist?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport • Communities have more of a role, keep identity • Avoid conflict e.g. industry and residential • Responds to need of community • Supported • Should reflect the wishes of the settlement • Opportunity to change / improve a community • Development can be tailored to meet the needs of individual settlements whilst respecting the character, culture and context of an area • Potentially beneficial in improving individual communities, with development targeted on a needs basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it portrays a negative image of the area, over reliance on one • Good in theory, difficult to achieve in planning context • Communities need to be balanced • Losing economy of scale, community may not see opportunities • Danger of unsympathetic development • Who decides what the role of the settlement should be • Role and function could be wrongly imposed on a community • There is a lack of flexibility • Development needs to be realistic
--	--

i) Release of greenfield sites to bolster declining settlements

<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regeneration of communities must be sustainable development & good design • Improves viability of communities – wider social mix • Will sustain the community as long as it is in scale with existing • Would help to energise local communities - balance with other strategies • No comment • This approach provides opportunities in the north, as more Greenfield land exists there • Depends on circumstances • Is good providing that land take is measured and targeted • In support of as a last resort to declining communities • Limited release 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental impact • Can become dormitory settlements – will incomers participate in community? • Environmental impact • Loss of green spaces and biodiversity of the countryside • No comment • Loss of countryside and wildlife habitat • Depends on circumstances • Environmental concerns over the loss of land • Loss of countryside and associated environmental impacts • Risk of empty older properties • Upset the communities • Environmental impact

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would depend on circumstances • Expanding a settlement would help the community in that area, provide it was eco-friendly • Within reason, where needed if it benefits settlement concerned • Will encourage regeneration of declining settlements & encourage people to stay • Prevents outward migration – help Upper Rhymney Valley • Declining settlements should not be allowed to die, wishes of local people should be respected • Help maintain existing settlements • Preserve services in declining settlements • Potentially beneficial to areas in need of regeneration, however development needs to be targeted and sensible • Potentially beneficial if the development of greenfield land is in the interests of regeneration and a positive benefit to a community can be demonstrated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield • Use up green spaces & countryside • Loss of irreplaceable resource / biodiversity • Some settlements have to decline, it would not be wise use of money to support them • Loss of attractive greenfield sites • Reducing greenfield sites – e.g. impact on tourist potential, ecosystem damage • Not addressing the basic problems experienced in a locality • Impact on the environment and countryside
--	--

Any Additional Comments:

Must provide services / infrastructure to support growth

Must take into consideration needs of families / children

Planning development policy has to be targeted for where it's for, should focus on local people

CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options

(Please tick a maximum of **6 'strongly support'** and **6 'strongly oppose'** for those component parts where a strong view is held by the group. Where there is not a strong view please leave blank).

All Groups Combined

OPTION A: CONTINUATION OF UDP DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY	Strongly Support	Strongly Oppose
a) Consolidate development in the south of the county borough within existing settlements		Yes
b) Allow for the redevelopment of large brownfield sites in the south for mixed use development		
c) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements		
d) Continue to promote growth in the Mid Valleys Corridor		Yes
e) Release of greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor to allow for additional growth		Yes
f) Allow for development opportunities in the North and in the Aber Valley	Yes	
g) Continue previous growth pattern		Yes

OPTION B: URBAN CONTAINMENT STRATEGY	Strongly Support	Strongly Oppose
a) Exploit brownfield opportunities	Yes	
b) Allow for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available	Yes	
c) Reduce impact of development on the countryside	Yes	

d)	Reduce the need to find new sites for development to accommodate future growth		Yes
e)	Sustain existing service provision		
f)	Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements		

OPTION C: SUSTAINABLE GROWTH STRATEGY		Strongly Support	Strongly Oppose
a)	Emphasis on key locations near transport routes		
b)	Target new development to support threatened services		
c)	Expanded settlements		
d)	Potential impact on the countryside		Yes
e)	Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements	Yes	
f)	Proactively targeting growth to the Mid Valley and Upper Valley Areas		
g)	Prevent over heating in the Caerphilly Basin		
h)	Development targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements	Yes	
i)	Release of greenfield sites to bolster declining settlements		

MEETING: FOCUS GROUP (7)		
OPTION 1: POP. LOSS	OPTION 2: BALANCE	OPTION 3: POP. GROWTH
1	4	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trends of outward migration and an ageing population need to be reversed - Areas could become surplus to requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical trends and national demographic data support this option. • Should strive for population balance and sustainable communities. • A steady state scenario is the safest to calculate from - There is no strong evidence to support either population growth or decline in the Borough. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption that Caerphilly will absorb growth pressure from Cardiff – Therefore need to accommodate an increasing population. • Population increase is forecast – Therefore need to focus on North and Mid Valleys.

MEETING: SUSTAINABILITY GROUP (7)		
OPTION 1: POP. LOSS	OPTION 2: BALANCE	OPTION 3: POP. GROWTH
0	3	4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outward migration would lead to declining communities, whereas in-migration would lead to adverse impacts on landscape and biodiversity that characterise the Borough. • Very difficult to predict the movement of human nature. • Unless infrastructure, employment and other facilities decline / improve, there is no reason to expect any material change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New housing in the Borough is much cheaper than in Cardiff and Newport - Will encourage inward migration. • Within commuter belt zone for inward migration to South Wales, so should plan for population increase – Will lead to inward investment, improved facilities and increased health. • Would lead to regeneration of the North and Mid Valleys regions contributing to greater cultural, employment and sustainability opportunities. • Maximises the opportunity to create sustainable communities and attract inward investment to improve employment, services and infrastructure.

MEETING: STANDING CONFERENCE & AREA STEERING GROUP (56)		
OPTION 1: POP. LOSS	OPTION 2: BALANCE	OPTION 3: POP. GROWTH
3	19	34
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence regarding improvement of declining populations, particularly in the Upper Valley where there is an elderly population and few opportunities for youngsters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would reduce the need for further development. • Elderly population, poor health and lack of employment opportunities. • Welsh Post industrial society provides no reason for increasing populations. • Elderly population counteracted by high birth rate. • Plan for this so as not to overdevelop and maintain property prices. • Maintain population and consumption levels of resources. • Appears to be the currently emerging trend. • To provide and maintain a balanced society with equal opportunities for all. • Increasing population can only bring problems. • This option would protect the existing infrastructure and environment. • To protect the interests of existing communities. • It would be unwise to encourage population growth that would outpace provision of employment, transport and leisure provision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheaper housing stock in the Valleys. • Needed to support declining communities. • Belief that population will grow. • Due to the opening up of the EU, population will grow due to in-migration because of higher standards of living in the UK. • Most realistic and positive option. • Will enhance and diversify existing services. • Will see in-migration from abroad as well as locally from Cardiff and Newport. • Growth will bring more wealth and industry to the area, which will use Brownfield sites and strengthen the economy. • Development along the Heads of the Valley Corridor and in Cardiff will lead to in-migration. • Affordability of housing will attract people to the Borough. • Cardiff overspill. • Without growth you achieve stagnation, which itself brings discontent and out-migration. • EU opening up will increase the number of Eastern Europeans entering the Borough. • Lower income families will be forced into the Valley areas for housing. • It is better to over-assess the population than to under-provide. • Growth of Cardiff commuter belt. • Increased level of tourism attracting people to the area.

MEETING: STAKEHOLDER PANEL (6)		
OPTION 1: POP. LOSS	OPTION 2: BALANCE	OPTION 3: POP. GROWTH
0	1	5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-migration destroying valley culture. • Loss of younger population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infra structure improvement like the SEW and Heads of the Valleys will make the Borough more attractive. • In-migration from Cardiff and Newport.

PUBLIC RESPONSES (3)		
OPTION 1: POP. LOSS	OPTION 2: BALANCE	OPTION 3: POP. GROWTH
0	2	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends indicate a fairly stable population, which is unlikely to change substantially. • Poor levels of health, education and infrastructure would mitigate against large population growth. • Continued growth in the south through in-migration from Cardiff and Newport – Continued decline in the North. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caerphilly CB is well placed to support expansion from overcrowded Cardiff and Newport.

GROWTH OPTIONS: TOTAL FOR ALL GROUPS (79)		
OPTION 1: POP. LOSS	OPTION 2: BALANCE	OPTION 3: POP. GROWTH
4	29	46

Appendix C

Sustainability Group Workshops Findings

Option A – UDP Development Strategy

Positive Impacts	Negative impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Support threatened communities ☉ Accessible housing and employment to all within the county borough ☉ Create potential for integrated transport ☉ Reduce need for long distance commuting ☉ Retain older buildings and regenerate existing communities ☉ Restoration and re-use of older buildings and landscapes ☉ Requirements for utilities (Water) already known ☉ Opportunities to development away from floodplain ☉ Removal of contaminated land ☉ Moving away from landfill in south & mid valleys ☉ Potential for habitat improvement through planning gain ☉ Containment in south protects biodiversity ☉ Allow for renewable energy in the north ☉ Potential to resolve infrastructure problems through planning gain ☉ Allow for improvements to infrastructure (particularly in the north) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Place excessive strain on existing services ☉ Not pro-active enough in the north ☉ Result in increased congestion in mid-Valleys and Caerphilly Basin ☉ Development not backed up by improvements to infrastructure ☉ Potential to encroach on high quality landscapes (especially mid-valley) ☉ Loss of greenfield sites in mid-valleys ☉ Increased hard surface/footprint and potential increase risk of flooding ☉ Additional services required ☉ Increasing flood risk in the south ☉ Loss of potential geologically important sites ☉ Loss of geological features ☉ Reduced capability to adapt to climate change ☉ Less focus on older, less efficient houses in the north ☉ Pressure on key nature conservation sites and fragmentation of habitat ☉ Potential for conflict with other strategies due to inflexibility ☉ Pressure on existing infrastructure in the south.
Key (Significant) Positive Impacts	Key (Significant) Negative Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Reduce need for long distance commuting ☉ Support threatened communities ☉ Containment in south protects biodiversity ☉ Potential to resolve infrastructure problems through planning gain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☉ Pressure on existing infrastructure in the south. ☉ Development not backed up by improvements to infrastructure ☉ Result in increased congestion in mid-Valleys and Caerphilly Basin ☉ Loss of greenfield sites in mid-valleys ☉ Potential to encroach on high quality landscapes (especially mid-valley)

Option B – Urban Containment Strategy

Key Positive Impacts	Key Negative impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ① Reduce urban sprawl, protect countryside ① Sustain services by locating new development in close proximity ① Potential for sustainable transport (including walking and cycling) ① New development located close to existing centres reduces commuter demand ① Rehabilitation of important redundant buildings ① Encourages the protection of open space both urban and rural ① Potential to open up areas of land outside of flood plain ① Maximise use of water infrastructure ① Removal/treatment of contaminated land ① Potential to enhance green corridors ① Protection of Greenfield habitats ① Less short length trips, reduce CO₂ emissions ① Less overall environmental damage ① Greater choice and access to infrastructure/services ① Concentrated improvement to infrastructure through planning gain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ① Increased pressure on recreational space (particularly in urban areas) ① Does not take account of need ① Increased urban congestion ① Cumulative effects increase pollution in the south ① Continued decline of declining rural settlements ① Doesn't support non-brownfield areas or their services. ① Increased risk of flooding ① Potential for pollution of aquifers ① Doesn't take account for flood plains ① Potential cost of remediation of contaminated land (economically feasible?) ① Loss of brownfield land of high ecological value ① Loss of urban habitat and connectivity ① Reduced ability to adapt to change due to locational constraints on sites ① Less opportunity for new, efficient housing in the north ① Only emphasis on the south of the County Borough
Key (Significant) Positive Impacts	Key (Significant) Negative Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ① Protection of Greenfield habitats ① Sustain services by locating new development in close proximity ① Reduce urban sprawl, protect countryside ① Encourages the protection of open space both urban and rural ① Maximise use of infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ① Loss of brownfield land of high ecological value ① Does not take account of need ① Increased pressure on recreational space (particularly in urban areas) ① Doesn't take account for flood plains ① Increased urban congestion

Option C – Sustainable Growth

Key Positive Impacts	Key Negative impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ Maintain and reinforce communities ④ Even spread of development retains services with associated benefits ④ Less short length trips, reduce CO₂ emissions ④ Less commuting, reducing the need to travel ④ Opportunity to invest in ‘sense of place’ ④ Sustain and enhance character and culture of existing communities ④ Investment in additional water infrastructure, particularly SUDS and other sustainable solutions. ④ Opportunity to direct development away from flood plains ④ Could force the improvement of infrastructure ④ Local sourcing of materials, including recycling ④ Protection and enhancement of conservationally sensitive sites through planning gain ④ Flexibility to adapt to changing climate ④ Encourage recycling/renewable trends and opportunity for renewable energy ④ Maximise use of existing infrastructure ④ Potential to maximise use of existing infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ Increase pressure on already stretched services ④ Potential to encourage commuter living ④ Increase congestion on arterial routes ④ Overall impact will be negative unless full package of landuses are provided ④ Potential loss of ‘sense of place’, particularly in respect of landscape ④ Loss of Greenfield sites ④ Increased hard surface/footprint and potential increase risk of flooding ④ Exacerbation of flooding due to run-off issues where Greenfield sites are developed ④ Potential loss of geologically important sites ④ Potential loss of soils on the urban fringe ④ Loss of habitat and connectivity ④ Impact upon the countryside ④ Increased carbon demand ④ Whole package required ④ Pressure on existing services already under strain ④ Ability of infrastructure to cope.
Key (Significant) Positive Impacts	Key (Significant) Negative Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ Encourage recycling/renewable trends and opportunity for renewable energy ④ Maintain and reinforce communities ④ Sustain and enhance character and culture of existing communities ④ Flexibility to adapt to changing climate ④ Opportunity to invest in ‘sense of place’ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ Overall impact will be negative unless full package of landuses are provided ④ Potential loss of ‘sense of place’, particularly in respect of landscape ④ Impact upon the countryside ④ Increase congestion on arterial routes ④ Pressure on existing services already under strain

APPENDIX D

List of Attendees at Strategy Workshops

LDP Focus Group – 28th July 2006

Elected Members	Officers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Cllr Keith Griffiths, Cabinet Member for Transportation & Planning •Cllr David Hardacre, Cabinet Member for Education and Leisure •Cllr Lindsay Whittle, Leader of the Opposition •Cllr Geoffrey Hibert, Member of the Majority Opposition •Cllr Janet Jones, Representative of the Sustainable Development Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Pat Mears, Chief Planning Officer •Rhian Kyte, Team Leader for Strategic and Development Planning •Mark Rees-Williams, Chief Engineer •Chris Francis, for the Chief Housing Officer •Phil Davy, Head of Economic Development, Tourism and European Affairs •Bleddyn Hopkins, Head of Planning and Strategy, Education & Leisure •Peter Gomer, Head of Lifelong Learning and Leisure •Albert Heaney, Assistant Director, Resourcing and Performance, Social Services •John Rogers, Principal Solicitor for Planning, Land and Highways •Paul Cooke, Sustainable Development Co-ordinator •Sian Lewis, Living Environment Co-ordinator •Jane Roberts-Waite, Regeneration Co-ordinator

Sustainability Group - 17th August 2006

External Partners	Council Officers
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kerry Rogers, Countryside Council For Wales• Caroline Drayton, Environment Agency• Stanley Evelyn, BT• Neil Maylan, Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust• Alison Palmer, GAVO• PC Morgan, Gwent Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Neil Daniels, Caerphilly CBC (Landscape)• Alison Jones, Caerphilly CBC (Ecology)• Suzanne Cousins, Caerphilly CBC (Environmental Health – Pollution)• Clive Campbell, Caerphilly CBC (Highways)• Steve Martin, Caerphilly CBC (Energy)• Steve Lawrence, Caerphilly CBC (Education)• Ralph Bourke, Caerphilly CBC (Research)• Derek Price, Caerphilly CBC (Leisure)

Standing Conference – 23rd August 2006

Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:
Alun Jones	Caerphilly CBC	Alun Thomas	Gwent Police
Berwyn Jones	South Wales Fire Service	Bron Lloyd	Seren Group
Christine Williams	Caerphilly County Borough Crossroads	Clair Stonelake	DEIN
Clive Williams	LHB	Cllr David Poole	Caerphilly CBC
Cllr E. K. Griffiths	Caerphilly CBC	Cllr Gwyn Price	Caerphilly CBC
Cllr Harry Andrews	Caerphilly CBC	Cllr Tudor Davies	Caerphilly CBC
Corrine Williams	British Red Cross	David Finch	Ystrad Mynach College
David Hopkins	Caerphilly CBC	David Thomas	Caerphilly CBC
Dee Ashurst	Forestry Commission	Glenda Genner	GAVO
Ivan Hill	Venture Wales	Jack Evans	South Wales Fire Service
James Cooper	Caerphilly County Borough Access Group	Joe Howsam	Caerphilly CBC
John Ware	Caerphilly CBC	Judith Paget	Caerphilly Local Health Board
Julie Carter	Careers Wales Gwent	June Davies	Caerphilly CBC
Kerry Morgan	National Public Health Service	Lesley Thomas	Voluntary Sector Representative
Mandy Sprague	Caerphilly CBC	Margaret Hunt	CPRW
Maria Chapman	Caerphilly CBC	Marj Edwards	Community Partnerships Representative
Mererid Bowley	National Public Health Service	Neil Barber	Seren Group
Nigel Forster	Groundwork Caerphilly	Ray Thompson	Caerphilly 50+ Forum
Roger Webb	Caerphilly CBC	Sandra Cooper	Caerphilly County Borough Access Group
Steven Rogers	Gwent Wildlife Trust	Tony Sheehan	Caerphilly Business Forum
Tony Whittaker	United Welsh Housing Association	Tracey Deacon	National Public Health Service
Virginia Fancourt	Caerphilly County Borough Crossroads		

Joint Area Steering Group – 23rd August 2006

Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:
Cllr Lyn Ackerman	Caerphilly CBC	Cllr Harry Andrews	Caerphilly CBC
Anne Arnold	Viewpoint Panel	Jamie Arr	Ty Sign & Local Communities Partnership
Dee Ashurst	Forestry Commission	Marian Barge	Penllwyn Communities Partnership
Peter Bissmire	Deri & Groesfaen Partnership	Diane Bissmire	Deri & Groesfaen Partnership
Prof. Trevor Boyns	Llanbradach & Pwyllypant Strategy P'shp	Dave Brunton	SYDIC
Com Cllr Phillip Cartwright	Nelson Community Council	Andrew Coles	Maesycwmmmer Partnership
Dr M. E. Conneely	Maesycwmmmer Partnership	P Cook	Blackwood Town Council
A Davies	Pengam & Communities P'shp	Oliviero Davies	Newbridge Partnership
Cllr. R. T. Davies	Caerphilly CBC	Susan Davies	Viewpoint Panel
Carolyn Donegan	The College Rhymney	Jacqui Donovan	Parents Network
Janice Drayton	Hengoed & Cefn Hengoed P'shp	Valerie Evans	Crosskeys & Pontywaun Residents Assoc.
Roger Evans	Viewpoint Panel	Peter Evans	Crosskeys & Pontywaun Residents Assoc.
Barbara Evans	Cancercareline	Brian Evans	Lower Surhowy Valley Comm P'shp
Mathew Farrel	Ty Sign & Local Communities Partnership	Keith Fletcher	Llanbradach & Pwyllypant Strategy P'shp
Anne Fritter	Parents Network	Ceinwen Garland	Viewpoint Panel
Com Cllr Robert Gough	Llanbradach & Pwlylpant Community Council	M. Griffiths	Viewpoint Panel
Nancy Harris	The College Rhymney	Karen Harvey	Greater Bargoed CF Partnership
Christopher Hawker	Cefn Fforest Community Partnership	Cllr Geoffrey Hibbert	Caerphilly CBC
Com Cllr Jennifer Hibbert	Caerphilly Town Council	Shirley Hobbs	Ty Sign & Local Communities Partnership
Mr Humphrey	Viewpoint Panel	Lynne John	Britannia Community Association
Clive Jones	Ystrad Mynach Partnership	Martyn Landrygan	Deri & Groesfaen Partnership
Sian Lewis	Caerphilly CBC	Garry Lewis	Argoed Community Council

Christopher Lloyd	Penllwyn Communities Partnership	Con Lucas	Blackwood Methodist Church
Richard Mann	United Welsh Housing	Terry McCarthy	Viewpoint Panel
Val Meredith	Viewpoint Panel	Susan Miles	Viewpoint Panel
Ray Moore	Oakdale & Penmaen Comm P'shp	John Morgan	Viewpoint Panel
Peter Nelson	Viewpoint Panel	Debbie Powell	Rhymney CF Partnership
Cllr Denver Preece	Caerphilly CBC	Cllr Dianne Price	Caerphilly CBC
Cllr Allan Pritchard	Caerphilly CBC	Cllr Judith Pritchard	Caerphilly CBC
Carol Pym	Viewpoint Panel	Com Cllr June Rao	Maesycwmmmer Community Council
M. Rees	VALREC	Cllr Graham Simmonds	Caerphilly CBC
HJ Stockton	Viewpoint panel	Howard Stone	Friends of Newbridge Memo
Linda Sturgess	Maesycwmmmer Partnership	Cllr B. M. Toomer	Caerphilly CBC
Adam Viggers	Crosskeys & Pontywaun Residents Assoc.	John Walbeoff	New Tredegar Partnership
Jeanette Watson	Oakdale & Penmaen Comm P'shp	Helen Whitney	Newbridge Partnership
Tony Wilkins	Lower Sirhowy Valley Comm P'shp	Allfred J. Williams	Viewpoint Panel
C. Williams	Viewpoint Panel	Cllr Allen Williams	Caerphilly CBC
Cllr Tom Williams	Caerphilly CBC	John Williams	Viewpoint Panel

Stakeholder Panel – 24th August 2006

Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:
Mr Douglas Easterbrook	Member of the General Public	Ms Caroline Maguire	Youth Forum Officer
Ms Joy Edwards	Member of the General Public	Mrs Vivienne Pearson	Member of the General Public
Mr Rob Gough	GAVO	Ms Debbie Powell	Rhymney CF Partnership

Mrs Lynda Healy	Blaenau Gwent CBC	Mr Richard Price	House Builders Federation
Mr Stephen Thomas	Torfaen CBC	Ms Zowie Purves	Member of the General Public
Ms Becky Lewis	Member of the General Public	Mr John Soos	Mountain View Residents Association
Ms Susan Lewis	St Martin's OAP Association	Mr Russel Thurlow	Member of the General Public
Mr Conrad Lucas	Islwyn Methodist Church	Ms Stella Williams	Member of the General Public

NOTE: Support Staff, Facilitators and Scribes at the above events are not listed.