



SITE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

**DEPOSIT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
 UP TO 2021**

October 2008

METHODOLEG A SESIAD SA FLE

**CYNLLUN ADNEUO DATBLYGU LLEOL
 HYD AT 2021**

Hydref 2008



**CAERPHILLY COUNTY BOROUGH
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Up to 2021**

**BWRDEISTREF SIROL CAERFFILI
CYNLLUN DATBLYGU LLEOL
Hyd at 2021**

**BACKGROUND PAPER 14
CANDIDATE SITE ASSESSMENT
METHODOLOGY**

**PAPUR CEFNDIR 14
SAFLE YMGEISYDD ASESIAID
METHODOLEG**

**LDP DEPOSIT
October 2008**

**CDL ADNEUO
Hydref 2008**

**Pat Mears
Chief Planning Officer
Planning Division
Directorate of the Environment
Caerphilly County Borough Council
Pontllanfraith House
Pontllanfraith
Blackwood
NP12 2YW**

**Pat Mears
Prif Swyddog Cynllunio
Is-Adran Cynllunio
Cyfadran yr Amgylchedd
Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Caerffili
Ty Pontllanfraith
Pontllanfraith
Coed Duon
NP12 2YW**

CONTENTS		Page
1	Introduction	14.2
2	Densities for Residential Development in the LDP	14.3
3	LDP Site Assessment Category References	14.5
4	Small Sites	14.6
	4.1 Small Site Assessments	14.6
	4.2 Settlement Boundary Review	14.6
5	Candidate Site Assessments	14.8
	5.1 Initial Planning Assessment	14.8
	5.2 Expert Assessments	14.8
	5.3 Countryside and Landscape	14.8
	5.4 Highways	14.9
	5.5 Environmental Health	14.9
	5.6 Consideration of Expert Assessments	14.9
6	Assessment Against the Preferred Strategy	14.10
7	Site Suitable for Further Consideration	14.13
	7.1 Further Consideration	14.13
	7.2 Housing Sites Conformity to the Preferred Strategy	14.13
	7.3 Proximity to Services and Facilities	14.14
	7.4 Availability of Land with Planning Consent	14.14
	7.5 Previously Developed Land	14.14
	7.6 Level of Constraints	14.15
	7.7 Land Drainage	14.15
	7.8 Social Infrastructure	14.15
	7.9 Statutory Undertakers	14.16
 Appendices		
1	Settlement Boundary Review	
2	Expert Assessment Proformas	
3	Position of Sites Suitable for Further Consideration at Preferred Strategy Stage	

1 Introduction

- 1.1 As part of the early stages of plan preparation, the Council invited all landowners with an interest in the County Borough to submit details of their land for consideration regarding its suitability for inclusion in the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (LDP). This was undertaken by local advertisement, including the Caerphilly C.B.C. website, and through direct correspondence with known developers and landowners. The sites submitted as part of this process are referred to as **candidate sites**. The submission of a candidate site for consideration by the Council does not imply that the site is suitable or otherwise for development.
- 1.2 In order to ensure that land identified in the Local Development Plan is capable of development and can contribute to the delivery of the Development Strategy, candidate sites have undergone stringent assessments to determine their suitability for further consideration as part of the LDP process.
- 1.3 The procedure outlined in this paper is designed to ensure that there is a clear, transparent and objective assessment procedure in place, which makes the process accessible to all interested persons and organisations. The assessment procedure can be categorised into a number of stages, each of which will be examined in more detail in the following sections.

2 Densities for Residential Development in the LDP

- 2.1 In the preparation of the UDP, the average density for residential developments was calculated to be 25 units per hectare, on the basis of the residential densities at that time. As part of the evidence base for the LDP it has been necessary to revisit the information on density to identify whether the average density of residential development has changed in light of recent planning consents. The new average density was calculated prior to the assessment of candidate sites in 2005 and was used in identifying the nominal capacity of potential housing sites in the LDP and calculations of housing land supply.
- 2.2 The new calculations of average density are based on the site area and number of dwellings as listed in planning applications. This information is recorded as part of the Joint Housing Land Availability Study (JHLAS). For the purposes of this calculation, the study with the base date of 1 July 2005 has been used. Any applications that have been approved after this date have not been included in the calculations in order to maintain consistency.
- 2.3 The calculations are based on information on residential development from three sources, as listed in the 1 July 2005 JHLAS:
- H1 sites that had valid full or reserved planning approval as of the date of approval of the Unitary Development Plan by the Council in 2003.
 - Committed housing (HC) sites that had valid full or reserved matters planning consent as of the date of approval of the Unitary Development Plan by the Council in 2003.
 - Sites of over 10 units that have not been allocated for residential development in the Unitary Development Plan and have valid full or reserved matters planning consent as of the date of approval of the Unitary Development Plan by the Council in 2003.
- 2.4 Outline planning permissions on H1, HC and sites with no development plan allocation have not been included in the calculations. Where an outline residential application does not specify the number of dwellings, a standard density of 25 units/ha has been used for the purposes of providing an indicative figure for calculations of housing land supply. Given that this figure is only approximate and is based on historic densities rather than actual numbers of units proposed on a site, the inclusion of outline permissions in the calculations would give a distorted impression of the densities and therefore this information has not been used.
- 2.5 Where a site is identified for a mixed-use development, such as Castlegate in Caerphilly, the area of land identified specifically for residential use has been used, rather than the total area of the site.
- 2.6 Where sites have identified constraints that may restrict the comprehensive development of the land – for example, the presence of a SINC or trunk sewer – the area of the site including the land that is constrained has been used in the calculation. In reality, many sites will be subject to some constraint that restricts the comprehensive development of the land. Therefore, the inclusion of constrained areas in calculations of density is a more realistic approach.

- 2.7 Taking into account the densities achieved on past developments, the average density has been calculated to be **35 units per hectare**.
- 2.8 This figure has been used to determine the notional capacity of candidate sites deemed most suitable for housing to accommodate residential units.

3 LDP Site Assessment Category References

- 3.1 In addition to the sites put forward by landowners for consideration through the candidate site process, many additional sites from a number of sources have also been assessed including sites in Council ownership, undeveloped sites that have been considered in the past and current development plans and sites suggested by senior planning officers where there has been developer interest previously.
- 3.2 The following references have been assigned to sites assessed as part of the LDP site assessment process:
- A** - Sites within the Council Approved UDP that have yet to be developed (but may have planning permission).
- B** - Committed Housing sites (HC) as listed in Appendix 1 Section B of the UDP that have yet to be developed (but may have planning permission).
- C** - Sites that featured in the draft and/or deposit UDP but were not included in the Council Approved UDP.
- D** - Sites identified by Council officers as having development potential, therefore requiring assessment. This included sites that had received past developer interest and sites in Council ownership that could potentially be brought forward for a more beneficial use.
- E** - Sites that were put forward by landowners as a result of the Council's invitation for landowners to submit sites issued in December 2005.
- F** - Sites that featured in the Islwyn or Rhymney Valley Local Plans that were undeveloped and do not fall into any of the above categories.
- 3.3 Each category was subject to the same robust site assessment process in order to determine its suitability for inclusion in the Local Development Plan, within the current policy context.

4 Small Sites

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The first stage of the assessment was to determine whether the sites were too small to be considered as part of the candidate sites process. For this, a size threshold of 0.33 hectares was determined on the basis of the proposed density of 35 units/hectare. Only sites greater than or equal to 0.33 hectares were considered as part of the assessment process. These sites progressed to the second stage of the assessment – the Initial Planning Assessment.

4.1.2 Sites submitted to the Council for consideration that were smaller than 0.33 hectares were referred to as 'small sites' and were dealt with in two different ways, depending on their location:

- The development of small sites within existing settlements is dependent upon the development control process. The development plan will provide criteria based policies for determining planning applications on small sites. Information on those sites lying within settlement boundaries is provided in the Candidate Sites Register.
- Small sites that adjoin, or lie in close proximity to, existing (UDP) settlement boundaries were assessed as part of the settlement boundary review to determine if they were appropriate for inclusion within the settlement boundary, in light of the LDP Preferred Strategy. Information on these can be found in Appendix 1.

4.2 Settlement Boundary Review

4.2.1 A key mechanism for achieving resource-efficient settlements and to indicate where growth will be permitted is the designation of settlement boundaries. The settlement boundary performs a number of important strategic functions, namely:

- Defining the area within which development would normally be allowed, taking into account all other material considerations;
- Promoting the full and effective use of urban land, thus concentrating development within settlements by preventing coalescence, ribbon development and fragmented development, where appropriate;
- Preventing inappropriate development in the countryside and acting as a tool to guide development control decisions, thus providing certainty to the public and developers

4.2.2 As well as small candidate sites, the settlement boundary review also examined planning permissions for new development, including those granted for change of use of land or buildings adjoining or lying slightly beyond the settlement boundaries as contained within the UDP. Where permissions have resulted in the natural and logical extension of a settlement, no useful purpose would be served by continuing to exclude such sites from the settlement boundary. However, it is necessary to look at each case within the context of its respective settlement.

4.2.3 In order to ascertain the suitability or otherwise of land for inclusion within, or exclusion from, settlement boundaries, a set of assessment criteria was drawn up. In order that the future pattern of development (insofar as this is affected by the location of settlement boundaries) adheres to the LDP's development strategy, it was

intended that these criteria should directly correlate with its eight key components. These components are as follows:

1. Target development to reflect the roles and functions of individual settlements;
2. Allow for development opportunities in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area;
3. Promote a balanced approach to managing future growth;
4. Exploit brownfield opportunities where appropriate;
5. Promote resource efficient settlement patterns;
6. Ensure that development contributes towards necessary infrastructural improvements;
7. Ensure that development provides necessary community facilities;
8. Reduce the impact of development upon the countryside.

4.2.4 The assessment criteria are set out below. The relevant strategy component numbers are included in brackets:

- Brownfield sites should be included where they are in reasonable proximity to existing settlements. Their development should be environmentally sustainable, taking into account the possibility of mitigation (4, 5, 8);
- Development of the site should represent a natural and logical extension to the existing settlement (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8);
- Development of the site should represent natural infill, where there is a need for a wider choice of housing (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8);
- Development of the site should be of a use and scale in accordance with the role and function of the settlement in question, as defined in the plan (1, 2, 3, 5, 6);
- Development of the site would not result in the coalescence of settlements (5, 8);
- Development of the site would not represent an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside (3, 5, 8);
- Development of the site should not jeopardise the existence of a current land-use, where such a use serves an important community function and is unlikely to be replaced as part of such development (1, 3, 7).

4.2.5 Each site was assessed against the above criteria along with those factors such as the candidate site assessment process, the existence of planning permission and whether any conflicting allocations or designations were proposed, as set out by the LDP. The results of this assessment can be found in **Appendix 1**.

5 Candidate Site Assessments

5.1 Initial Planning Assessment

5.1.1 All sites greater than or equal to 0.33 hectares were subject to an Initial Planning Assessment, which examined the following broad planning issues:

- Relationship to existing settlements;
- Proximity to sites of national importance for biodiversity
- Compatibility with neighbouring uses;
- Flood risk designation;
- Relevant planning history;

5.1.2 The Initial Planning Assessment determined whether a site was considered suitable in planning terms for the proposed use identified by the landowner, or whether an alternative use would be more appropriate. Candidate sites that were regarded as unsuitable for any major land use were deemed to have failed the Initial Planning Assessment and were not considered suitable for further consideration as part of the LDP process. No further assessment was therefore undertaken on the sites.

5.1.3 All sites were assessed for a range of uses and recommendations were made on those deemed suitable for further consideration, taking into account constraints present on the site. It should be noted that in some instances the planning preferred use might differ from the original use put forward by the landowner.

5.2 Expert Assessments

5.2.1 All sites that satisfied the Initial Planning Assessment were subject to detailed expert assessment undertaken by a wide range of specialists in relation to Countryside and Landscape, Highways and Environmental Health. These assessments were based on the preferred land use and, where housing is the preferred use, the notional capacity identified as a result of the initial assessment.

5.2.2 The proformas and explanatory notes used to complete these assessments can be found in **Appendix 2**.

5.3 Countryside and Landscape

5.3.1 The Countryside and Landscape assessment examined the principle of allocating sites within the LDP, taking into account landscape issues including trees and hedgerows as well as ecological issues including European, national and local designations and species.

5.3.2 Where part or all of a site has been identified as having particular conservation or landscape value that would preclude the land from being developed, this has been taken into account in the overall assessment of the site's suitability. The feasibility of developing the remaining land has been considered, along with possible conflict between areas to be protected from development and possible access to the site in order to inform a reasoned judgement on the suitability of the site for the type of development specified. Where there was a need for additional surveys to be undertaken prior to development these were identified.

5.4 Highways

- 5.4.1 The Highways proformas examined the potential impact on the highways network of proposed developments identifying the proposed traffic generation as well as access on to the existing highways network and the level of constraint in achieving an acceptable access. An overall recommendation is provided on whether access can be achieved taking into account all considerations including the viability of proposals and whether additional information such as a Traffic Impact Assessment would be required.

5.5 Environmental Health

- 5.5.1 The Environmental Health proforma has taken account of issues including odour, light, noise, waste and potential contamination. On sites where potential nuisances have been identified, additional information may be required through surveys and ground investigations prior to a decision on the suitability of the site. The potential constraints identified in these surveys should be weighed up in light of the other assessments, although potential nuisances are not on their own reasons to justify the ruling out of a site if only 'potential' rather than confirmed.

5.6 Consideration of the Expert Assessment

- 5.6.1 A Planning Assessment Team comprising senior planning officers from Development Control and Strategic Planning considered the results of the expert assessments.
- 5.6.2 On the basis of the expert assessments, the team determined whether a site is suitable for development in full or in part, and whether or not the site should be given further consideration for inclusion within the LDP. It is important to note that at this stage these decisions were in principle only. A significant amount of further work, including further consultation with statutory undertakers, was required in order to finally determine the suitability or otherwise, of a site for development and thus for its inclusion in the LDP. It should be noted that the outcome of the site assessment process at this point was provisional and individual sites may have subsequently been re-categorised on the basis of new information.
- 5.6.3 Where further survey work has been identified as being necessary, for example in respect of ground contamination, traffic impact assessments, presence of habitats, conditions of trees and hedgerows, etc this was identified in the Candidate Sites Register.
- 5.6.3 Sites failing to satisfy the Planning Assessment Team did not proceed to an assessment against the eight component parts of the preferred strategy.

6 Assessment Against the Preferred Strategy¹

- 6.1 Sites identified as being suitable for further consideration as a result of an examination of the outcomes of the expert assessments were then assessed against the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy.
- 6.2 Each of the component parts are discussed below in order to highlight the key considerations in the assessment of the suitability of sites against these criteria.

Allow for development opportunities in the Heads of the Valleys

- 6.3 With regards to housing, the Strategy identifies that new housing should be accommodated in villages where there is a need to diversify the housing stock in order to retain the existing population and regenerate deprived communities in the Heads of the Valleys areas. Proposals for other appropriate land use allocations, such as employment or community facilities, would also help to regenerate these areas.
- 6.4 Any sites located in the Upper Rhymney and Upper Sirhowy Valley areas, which fall within the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area, are regarded as meeting this component part of the Strategy.

Promote a balanced approach to managing future growth

- 6.5 In promoting a balanced approach to growth, it is intended that development opportunities in the Southern Connections Corridor are limited to brownfield sites. In the Northern Connections Corridor and Heads of the Valleys, brownfield and greenfield sites for a range of uses are proposed for principal towns (Ystrad Mynach, Bargoed, Blackwood) and key settlements (Nelson, Newbridge, Rhymney). In the case of residential development, sites in settlements with good public transport links and mining villages that require additional housing to sustain them as viable residential areas will be promoted. Different levels of growth can be accommodated across the three strategy areas within the different settlements.
- 6.6 **Heads of the Valleys** – residential development will be concentrated on Bargoed, Rhymney, Pontlottyn, New Tredegar and Aberbargoed with limited housing development being promoted in Princetown, Fochriw, Abertysswg and Deri as there is a need for modern housing in these areas. It is not anticipated that there will be major change in Argoed, Hollybush or Markham.
- 6.7 **Northern Connections Corridor** – residential development will be concentrated in the Mid Valleys conurbation (Blackwood, Oakdale, Newbridge, Ystrad Mynach) as well as Nelson, Hengoed, Tir y Berth, Maesycwmmmer and Crumlin due to existing and potential rail links in these areas. Limited housing development will be promoted in Gelligaer and Trinant in order to maintain the viability of these settlements.
- 6.8 **Southern Connections Corridors** – The settlements of Risca-Pontymister, Abercarn, Cwmcarn, Ty Sign, Pontywaun, Cwmfelinfach, Wylie, Wattsville and Ynysddu in the Lower Islwyn area and Caerphilly, Bedwas, Llanbradach, Abertriwdr, Senghenydd, Trethomas, Graig y Rhacca, Waterloo, Rudry and Draethen in the

¹ Sites were assessed against the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy, rather than the Deposit Plan strategy. However, there were no major changes to the component parts of the strategy which feature in the Deposit Plan and therefore these assessments remain valid.

Caerphilly Basin are recognised as having a residential role with an emphasis on redeveloping existing sites rather than the release of greenfield sites.

- 6.9 In ensuring a balanced approach to growth, it is important that the provision of housing reflects local requirements and is supported by the provision of other facilities and employment opportunities. The allocation of other uses such as retail, employment and community facilities in appropriate locations will contribute to the overall balance of growth.

Exploit brownfield opportunities where appropriate

- 6.10 Caerphilly County Borough has significant areas of previously developed land that is available for redevelopment. In line with national planning guidance, brownfield sites are generally favoured for development over greenfield sites. Brownfield sites have therefore been allocated where they will not have an adverse effect on the role and function of the County Borough as a whole. Where there is a need to reserve land for employment or urban facilities in the Southern Connections Corridor and it is considered that the development of housing sites would undermine the role and function of settlements, such development will be resisted.

Promote resource efficient settlement patterns

- 6.11 The Preferred Strategy identifies that consideration should be given to promoting energy and efficiency and conservation measures in the siting and design of new developments. This can be achieved through the use of the settlement boundaries that reflect the functional analysis of the three strategy areas. For the purposes of the assessment of candidate sites for residential development to promote resource efficient settlement patterns, consideration has been given to whether sites promote the full and effective use of urban land, concentrate development within settlements, prevent coalescence, ribbon development and fragmented development and prevent inappropriate development in the countryside.

Ensure development contributes towards the necessary infrastructure improvements

- 6.12 Residential development will be required to contribute towards improvements to the strategic road network and other necessary infrastructure improvements, including improvement to the public transport system where necessary. Infrastructure improvements may also include the upgrading of utilities where improvements are not envisaged by the utility provider within the required timescales.

Ensure development provides the necessary community facilities

- 6.13 In addition to on-site requirements, residential development is likely to generate additional pressure on wider strategic leisure infrastructure such as leisure centres, playing fields and parks. Consequently, housing developments will be required to contribute towards improvements to the network of leisure infrastructure. Furthermore, contributions may be required to increase capacity at schools to accommodate pupils generated from new development.

Reduce the impact of development upon the countryside

- 6.14 In determining the suitability of sites for development, account was taken on whether the environment has the capacity to accommodate the development. In particular, the

need to protect or conserve the natural environment with landscape, biodiversity or agricultural value.

Target development to reflect the roles and functions of individual settlements

- 6.15 In line with the Preferred Strategy, consideration of the role and functions of individual settlements is key as not every use will be acceptable in every settlement, with only appropriate uses being allocated. In addition to the role and function of individual areas for housing development, the County Borough's principal towns and key settlements have other roles which were examined in determining the suitability of candidate sites.

Heads of the Valleys

- 6.16 **Bargoed** – the principal town has a key role as a retailing, leisure and employment centre. There is a need to diversify the range of housing.
- 6.17 **Rhymney** – the key settlement has tourism potential and could diversify its employment role.

Northern Connections Corridor

- 6.18 **Ystrad Mynach** – as a principal town it has a key role as a primary centre, in particular as the main centre for local government and services.
- 6.19 **Blackwood** – as another principal town, Blackwood has an important role as a retail centre and has a good relationship with the Oakdale Business Park for employment opportunities. It needs to continue to improve the retail offering and develop a new role for employment, particularly in relation to office development.
- 6.20 **Nelson** – the area is a key settlement with potential for a major employment role and a small retail role also serving adjoining villages in Merthyr Tydfil.
- 6.21 **Newbridge** – the key settlement has a role as a local shopping centre with the opening of the Ebbw Valley rail link offering opportunities for economic diversification.

Southern Connections Corridors

- 6.22 **Risca-Pontymister** – as the principal town for Lower Islwyn, there is opportunity for further employment and retail development, particular on brownfield land.
- 6.23 **Caerphilly** – the principal town plays a sub-regional role in relation to retail, employment, leisure and tourism.
- 6.24 **Bedwas** – as a key settlement, Bedwas is an important employment location with significant brownfield redevelopment opportunities available at Bedwas Colliery.

7. Sites suitable for Further Consideration

7.1 Further Consideration

7.1.1 The assessment of the suitability of sites for further consideration was published in the Candidate Sites Register and Appendix 10 of the Preferred Strategy (April 2007). Since the publication of this information, further assessment has been undertaken on those sites deemed suitable for further consideration to determine whether they were appropriate to include as allocations in the Deposit LDP. Housing was identified as the most appropriate use from a land use planning perspective for the majority of sites deemed suitable for further consideration. The following section identifies the further assessments undertaken on these potential housing sites to determine which should be allocated in the plan.

7.1.2 There were a few sites deemed suitable for further consideration for uses other than housing. These have been considered as part of other land use requirements in the LDP. The justification for the inclusion or otherwise of these sites in the Deposit LDP is identified within **Appendix 3**.

7.2 Housing sites conforming to the Preferred Strategy

7.2.1 Where sites were proposed for residential development or for a mix of uses including an element of housing, and were deemed suitable for further consideration, a rating was given based on how many of the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy that the site conformed with:

- Green – sites meeting all or most parts of the Preferred Strategy - 7-8 criteria;
- Amber – sites meeting most parts of the Preferred Strategy - 5-6 criteria;
- Red – sites scoring poorly in relation to the Preferred Strategy – meeting 4 or less criteria.

7.2.2 Sites that were rated as 'green' or 'amber' when assessed against the Preferred Strategy were regarded as most suitable for further consideration. Those sites classified as 'red' were deemed to have scored poorly in terms of the Preferred Strategy and therefore in most cases were not deemed to be considered to be suitable for inclusion within the LDP. However, in some situations where the inclusion of a site within a specific settlement may be appropriate in supporting the role and function of that settlement, for example, to bolster local schools and stabilise population decline, and a red site offers the only opportunity to achieve particular strategic aims, consideration has been given to the inclusion of suitable sites where this will not impact on other plan objectives.

7.2.3 Considering only those sites where the planning preferred use was for housing, and having reconsidered the boundaries of a number of duplicate and overlapping sites, the following results were found when sites were assessed against the Preferred Strategy:

- Red – 3,060 units on 15 sites;
- Amber – 5,102 units on 68 sites;
- Green – 2,463 units on 32 sites.

7.2.4 The housing land requirements are set out in Background Paper 6: Population and Housing. It should be noted that there are considerably more residential units proposed on green and amber sites than required and therefore not all sites that

have been deemed suitable when assessed against the Preferred Strategy have been included as allocations within the development plan.

7.2.5 Within each Strategy area, sites have been considered holistically on a settlement-by-settlement basis to determine the level of development that would best reflect the role and function of that settlement. Sites in principal towns and key settlements have been promoted where they meet other planning objectives, although limited housing development is encouraged in villages across the County Borough where there is a need to diversify the housing stock. In determining which sites were suitable a number of additional considerations have been taken into account, such as the proximity to services and facilities, the availability of land with planning consent, previously developed land status, the severity of constraints and the results of further internal and external consultation.

7.2.6 **Appendix 3** provides information on whether those sites deemed suitable for further consideration in the Preferred Strategy have been taken forward as allocations within the LDP and, if not, the justification for the decision not to include the site within the LDP.

7.3 Proximity to services and facilities

7.3.1 Where more sites were available in a particular settlement than necessary to reflect a balanced approach to growth, consideration has been given to the proximity of sites to facilities and services such as town or village centres, schools and/or public transport nodes including railway stations. In the interests of ensuring communities are sustainable, sites that are well related to jobs, shops and services have been favoured, as per the requirements of the Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (MIPPS) on Housing.

7.4 Availability of land with planning consent

7.4.1 As set out in Background Paper 6: Population and Housing, sites with planning consent for 10 or more dwellings make a significant contribution to the housing requirement figures. Where sites with planning consent exist within settlements, these can make a vital contribution in supporting the role and function of settlements, especially as the principle of development has been established and such sites are realistically likely to be developed within the plan period. In towns and villages that have large undeveloped sites with current planning consents (in some cases subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement), these have generally been taken forward as allocations where the sites also accord with the strategy. It should be noted that many of these sites were not submitted as part of the candidate site process but have been identified through the annual Joint Housing Land Availability Study, which monitors planning consents for housing. Further details on sites with planning consent can be found in Background Paper 6.

7.4.2 In settlements where there are other sites deemed suitable for further consideration that do not have the benefit of planning consent, consideration has been given to the need for additional sites to be allocated over and above those with planning permission, taking account of the role and function of the settlement and the size of the site proposed.

7.5 Previously developed land

7.5.1 The re-use of brownfield or previously developed land where appropriate is a key component of the Preferred Strategy and, in accordance with the Housing MIPPS, a

search sequence to determine which sites should be included in the LDP has been followed. Previously developed land and buildings within settlements has been given preference where appropriate taking into account the role and functions of settlements. Therefore, in settlements where both greenfield and brownfield sites have scored favourably in accordance with the assessment against the Preferred Strategy, brownfield sites will be allocated in preference to greenfield sites. In the Northern Connections Corridor and Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area, however, where no brownfield sites are available in individual settlements and the allocation of land would help support the role and function of these settlements, it may be necessary to allocate greenfield land as a means of building sustainable communities.

7.6 Level of constraints

- 7.6.1 It is recognised that all sites will have some level of constraint on them that may impact of the viability of development or reduce the developable area. The level and type of constraint will vary on a site-by-site basis. However, in settlements where more sites are available than are required to meet housing requirements and reflect a balanced approach to growth, those sites with the least constraints have been taken forward, having regard to other objectives, as sites with fewer constraints are more likely to come forward for development.

7.7 Land Drainage

- 7.7.1 As part of further internal consideration on the suitability of sites, the Council's land drainage section have been consulted with regards to the position of culverts on sites and other land drainage issues. This consultation has resulted in several potential housing sites being ruled out from further consideration.

7.8 Social Infrastructure

- 7.8.1 In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, the capacity of infrastructure, including social infrastructure such as schools and hospitals, to accommodate further development should also be a consideration in the allocation of housing sites.
- 7.8.2 With regards to hospital capacity, the Deposit LDP safeguards land to allow for the development of a new general hospital to serve the County Borough. This hospital already has the benefit of planning consent. As a new build facility, the hospital will have the capacity to serve future population needs.
- 7.8.3 The Council's education department have been consulted on the capacity of schools to accommodate the pupils generated from new developments either within existing school buildings or through new build facilities to be funded by the developer. In the majority of school catchment areas, additional pupils can be accommodated although developer contributions may be required to ensure that there is sufficient capacity within facilities through improvements or extensions to schools.
- 7.8.4 However, a small number of sites have not been taken forward for inclusion in the Deposit LDP on the grounds that there was insufficient capacity within the local school (as governed by Welsh Assembly Government guidelines on school capacity) and inadequate expansion space was available within school grounds to accommodate additional classroom spaces.

7.9 Statutory Undertakers

- 7.9.1 Following the completion of the site selection process, the Council has sought the views of appropriate external consultation bodies including Western Power Distribution, Welsh Water, Wales and West Utilities, Countryside Council for Wales, CADW, Gwent Police, South Wales Fire and Rescue Service, Environment Agency and Glamorgan and Gwent Archaeological Trust on the suitability of sites and any constraints to development.

Flood Risk

- 7.9.2 The requirements of *Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk* and consultation with the Environment Agency with regards to sites located within Zone C of the flood plain has been a major factor in the selection of sites, with a precautionary approach being adopted toward the allocation of highly vulnerable development such as housing and community facilities with zone C of the flood plain. An explanation of the approach to flooding within the LDP and the justification for the inclusion of sites within the flood plain is set out in Background Paper 13: Broad Level Assessment of Flood Risk, which forms part of the evidence base of the Plan.

Utilities

- 7.9.3 As part of the statutory undertaker consultation, utility providers have been consulted with regards to the capacity of the existing infrastructure. Whilst no sites have been ruled out on the basis of insufficient capacity, in some cases where sites may come forward in advance of regulatory improvements, the requirement for developers to fund essential improvements to the infrastructure has been identified in the Appendix to the LDP.

APPENDIX 1 – SMALL SITE ASSESSMENTS

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as Identified in Candidate Sites Register
Heads of the Valleys				
E246	Land adjacent to The Beeches Site is within, but adjoining, the existing settlement boundary. It is already developed and forms a defensible boundary, therefore no change deemed necessary.	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Residential
E159	Land off Bedwellty Road, opp. Caerslem Baptist Chapel Site lies within Aberbargoed and is not of relevance to the settlement boundary review.	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Residential
E356	Land south of Springfield Terrace Site presently overgrown and contains a derelict building. It appears to have no current use or value. It is deemed appropriate to revise the settlement boundary so as to include it.	Hollybush	Argoed	Residential
E23	Land off Hillside Avenue Site appears to have informal amenity value in its present condition. Inclusion of the site would be illogical and make the settlement boundary less defensible. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Markham	Argoed	Residential
E194	Land at The Rock containing the derelict Rock Community Hut Site is too far away from either Blackwood or Argoed to be included in either of their respective settlement boundaries. The Rock itself does not warrant one in its own right. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	The Rock	Argoed	Residential
E200	Land at site of 3 Argoed Buildings	The Rock	Argoed	Residential

	Site is too far away from either Blackwood or Argoed to be included in either of their respective settlement boundaries. The Rock itself does not warrant one in its own right. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land south of Fern Bank				
E53	Site is too far away from either Blackwood or Argoed to be included in either of their respective settlement boundaries. The Rock itself does not warrant one in its own right. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	The Rock	Argoed	Argoed	Residential
E242	Land immediately south of Penrhiw'r Eglwys, Penylan Road Site juts out east from the existing linear pattern of Argoed village, and as such, it is not felt that its inclusion would represent a natural extension to the settlement. Therefore, no change is deemed necessary.	Argoed	Argoed	Argoed	Residential
E409	Former school garage Main road serves as a defensible boundary along the eastern side of Hollybush. Consequently, this site would represent an anomalous inclusion. Therefore, no change is deemed necessary.	Hollybush		Argoed	Employment
C31	Chris Waite Car Sales Site is too far away from either Blackwood or Argoed to be included in either of their respective settlement boundaries. The Rock itself does not warrant one in its own right. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Blackwood/The Rock		Argoed	
E410	Land adjoining The Rhos, Railway Terrace Main road serves as a defensible boundary along the eastern side of Hollybush. Consequently, this site would represent an anomalous inclusion. Therefore, no change is deemed necessary.	Hollybush		Argoed	Residential
E221	Land south of Hillside Terrace	Deri		Darran Valley	Residential

	Site is characterised by fairly steep terrain (being located on a hillside) and would not constitute a natural or logical extension to the existing settlement. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land north of former Deri Service Station				
E369	Site is within, but adjoining, the existing settlement boundary, which has been extended so as to encompass Deri within a single boundary (as opposed to two separate sections as set out in the UDP). There is no change as regards the inclusion of this site. Land north of former Deri Service Station	Deri	Darran Valley		Residential
E370	Site lies outside, but abuts, the existing settlement boundary, which has been extended so as to encompass Deri within a single boundary (as opposed to two separate sections as set out in the UDP). As a result, the site will be included within the revised boundary.	Deri	Darran Valley		Residential
B02	McLaren Cottages Site within smaller, detached section of the Abertysswg settlement boundary. Given its distance from the rest of the settlement, this area of land will be removed from the settlement boundary and made subject to a VILL designation. As a result, this site will not be included within the revised boundary. Land east of Mountbatten	Abertysswg	Moriah		
E268	Site is elevated in comparison with the adjoining land (which is inside the existing boundary). Consequently, the boundary as it stands forms a natural limit. The inclusion of this site would not allow for a natural or logical extension of the existing settlement. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land adjacent to 22 Upper Road	Rhymney	Moriah		Residential
E186	Site lies within New Tredegar under the existing boundary. Changes have been made which will see the boundary constrict to	New Tredegar	New Tredegar		Residential

	the point that the site will abut the revised boundary. However, it will continue to be included.				
E223	Land adjacent to Bridge House Site lies within New Tredegar and is not of relevance to the settlement boundary review.	Brithdir	New Tredegar	Residential	
E131	Shepherds Field Inclusion of this site would also require the inclusion of land between it and Hill Road. There is no logical reason for the inclusion of this area if land within the settlement boundary. On top of this, the land will be made subject to a VILL designation within the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Pontlloftyn	Pontlloftyn	Residential	
Northern Connections Corridor					
E392	Land to rear of Cilgerran Way Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. Subject to SINC designation within LDP so inclusion would amount to unnecessary intrusion into countryside. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Blackwood	Blackwood	Residential	
E317	Land south of main road opp. Cwmnantgwynt farmland Site is too far away from either Aberbeeg or Trinant to be included in their respective settlement boundaries. Aberbeeg's boundary is being removed in any case. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Aberbeeg	Crumlin	Residential	
E332	Land to rear of Windsor Place Site is too far away from either Aberbeeg or Trinant to be included in their respective settlement boundaries. Aberbeeg's boundary is being removed in any case. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Aberbeeg	Crumlin	Residential	
E112	Land off Pantddu Road Site within existing settlement boundary. However, it is felt that	Aberbeeg	Crumlin	Residential	

	there is no need for further development in what is a very small rural settlement of relatively low density. Consequently, Aberbeeg's boundary is not warranted and will be removed. As a result, this site will no longer be included within a settlement boundary.				
D106	Land at Llanerch Lane Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. It is a field that has been landscaped to form a bike track. The inclusion of this site would risk development that would be out of keeping with the existing layout of the village – it would be neither infill, nor a natural extension. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Trinant	Crumlin		
D111	Land at Pentwyn Terrace Site is an ostensibly well-grassed area in close proximity to the residential area at the top of Pentwyn Terrace. There are signs that it is used for informal recreational purposes. Development of this site would not, therefore, represent natural infill, and its inclusion within the boundary would not be appropriate. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Trinant	Crumlin		
E372	Land at Cefn Hengoed Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. Although it has been developed, it juts out west, at odds with the prevailing pattern of the settlement. Consequently, it would not constitute a natural or logical extension. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Cefn Hengoed	Hengoed		Residential
E44	Land off Summerfield Hall Lane Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The inclusion of this site would represent an unnatural extension and an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside, especially as the site will be subject to Green Wedge and SINC designations under the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Maesycwmmmer	Maesycwmmmer		Residential
E394	Land at Prince Cottages	Fleur de Lys	Maesycwmmmer		Residential

	<p>Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The inclusion of this site would represent an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside, given that the site will be subject to a Green Wedge designation under the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p> <p>Land to rear of Homeleigh Estate</p>				
E236	<p>Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The inclusion and subsequent development of this site would not represent a natural or logical extension to the existing settlement, nor would it constitute natural infill. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p> <p>Land to rear of 23 and 23a Homeleigh Estate</p>	Newbridge	Newbridge	Newbridge	Residential
E192	<p>Site lies adjacent to a committed housing site on one side and a SINC on the other, and is scrubby in nature. The inclusion of the site would require a fiddly change to the boundary, which would also involve an adjoining back garden to the south. It is therefore felt that the inclusion of the site would be contrived and illogical, and that it is best left in its existing condition.</p> <p>Land to north of Grawend House</p>	Newbridge	Newbridge	Newbridge	Residential
E340	<p>Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. No reason not to include this site and the triangle of land between its northern edge and the road. As a result, this site will be included within a revised boundary.</p> <p>Land to west of Heol y Cefn</p>	Pentwynmawr	Newbridge	Newbridge	Residential
E347	<p>Site lies in open countryside between the Aberbargoed and Blackwood settlement boundaries. This land will be subject to Green Wedge and SINC designations under the LDP. Consequently, inclusion would amount to unnecessary intrusion into the open countryside. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p>	Britannia	Pengam	Pengam	Residential

E407	Land adjoining Heathfield Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. This land will be subject to a Green Wedge designation under the LDP. Consequently, inclusion would amount to unnecessary intrusion into the open countryside. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Gellihaaf	Pengam	Residential
E215	Land off Rhiw Sir Dafydd Hill Site is close to, but doesn't quite abut, existing settlement boundary. The road forms the most defensible boundary possible however, and therefore the inclusion of this site would not be natural or logical. The land will also be subject to Green Wedge and SINC designations within the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Oakdale	Penmaen	Residential
E222	Land adjacent to 39 Maes y Garn Road Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The site is not previously developed and its inclusion would not create a more defensible or logical boundary than currently exists. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Oakdale	Penmaen	Residential
E20	Land adjacent to Ty Gwyn, Cwmnantyrodyn Site lies outside existing boundary. The A472 forms the most defensible boundary possible, therefore the inclusion of this site would not be natural or logical. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Residential
E49	Land off Woodland Road, Cwmnantyrodyn Site lies outside existing boundary. The A472 forms the most defensible boundary possible, therefore the inclusion of this site would not be natural or logical. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Residential
E282	Land north east of Ton-y-Moch Cottages	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Residential

	Site lies outside existing boundary. The A472 forms the most defensible boundary possible, therefore the inclusion of this site would not be natural or logical. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.				
E281	Land north of Brynheulog Cottages Site lies outside existing boundary. The A472 forms the most defensible boundary possible, therefore the inclusion of this site would not be natural or logical. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Residential
E280	Land west of Brynheulog Cottages Site lies outside existing boundary. The A472 forms the most defensible boundary possible, therefore the inclusion of this site would not be natural or logical. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Residential
E10	Land east of West Road, Penallta Site lies within Ystrad Mynach and is included within LDP housing allocation 1.35. As a result, it is not of relevance to the settlement boundary review.	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Residential
Southern Connections Corridor					
E18	Land at rear of Newport Road Site lies within Abercarn and is not of relevance to the settlement boundary review.	Cwmcarn	Abercarn	Abercarn	Residential
E414	Land at end of Chapel Street Site abuts, but lies outside, existing boundary. However, the boundary will be brought in to the line of existing development, thereby leaving this site in the open countryside. Also, this site will be made subject to a VILL designation within the LDP. Consequently, inclusion of this site would amount to unnecessary intrusion into the countryside. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Abercarn	Abercarn	Abercarn	Residential

D114	Land adjoining Reeces Terrace Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. However, the site lies within a Green Wedge. Its inclusion would therefore represent an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land at Nantcarn Road	Cwmcarn	Abercarn	
D115	Site abuts, and lies within, existing settlement boundary. The land constitutes an area of garage development that is more in keeping with the built fabric of the existing settlement than the Green Wedge to the south. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land off Coedcae Road	Cwmcarn	Abercarn	
E261	Site is close to, but doesn't quite abut, existing settlement boundary. However, it is included within LDP housing allocation HG 1.76. As a result, this site will be included within a revised boundary.	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	Residential
D124	Land at Bronynydd Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. This site and the land adjacent to it are committed housing sites. It is therefore considered appropriate to include this land within a revised boundary.	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	
E162	Land east of Coedcae Road Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. However, it is included within LDP housing allocation HG 1.76. As a result, this site will be included within a revised boundary. Land at lower Francis Street	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	Residential
D123	Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The road forms an adequate defensible boundary. This consideration, along with members' concerns over potentially losing a site with an informal recreation purpose, means that no change is deemed	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	

	necessary.				
D127	<p>Land north of Brynheulog Terrace</p> <p>Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The line of existing development forms the most defensible boundary available. The land is subject to a SLA designation within the LDP. Consequently, inclusion would amount to unnecessary intrusion into the countryside. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p>	Machen	Bedwas, Tretomas & Machen		
D80	<p>Tredegar Street</p> <p>Site abuts, and lies within, existing settlement boundary. The road forms the most logical and defensible boundary possible. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p>	Crosskeys	Crosskeys		
E151	<p>Land adjacent to Homestead</p> <p>Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. However, the land to the north is being removed in order to locate the boundary along the line of the road. This site lies the 'wrong' side of the road and will also be subject to a SLA boundary within the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p>	Pontywaun	Crosskeys		Residential
E36	<p>Land north of Bryngwennol</p> <p>Site is close to, but doesn't quite abut, existing settlement boundary. The line of existing development forms the most defensible boundary. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p>	Llanbradach	Llanbradach		Residential
E105	<p>Land at Ty Isaf, Caerphilly</p> <p>Site is close to, but doesn't quite abut, existing settlement boundary. The line of existing development forms the most defensible boundary. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Llanbradach		Residential
E421	<p>Land at Underwood Bungalow</p>	Llanbradach	Llanbradach		Residential

	Site is close to, but doesn't quite abut, existing settlement boundary. The line of existing development forms the most defensible boundary. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land at The Bungalow, Penrhiw				
E383	Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The site has been developed and therefore warrants inclusion, along with the surrounding properties. As a result, this site will be included within a revised boundary. Land adjacent to Ty Sign Farm	Risca	Risca East		Residential
E205	Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. The road forms the most logical and defensible boundary possible. Also, the land is subject to a Green Wedge designation within the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land adjacent to Derwallt House, Pontymason Lane	Risca	Risca East		Residential
E152	Site lies well outside existing settlement boundary within the open countryside and therefore is of no relevance to the settlement boundary review. Land to south of Greenmeadow House	Risca	Risca East		Residential
E395	Site is close to, but doesn't quite abut, existing settlement boundary. The road forms the most logical and defensible boundary possible. Also, the land is subject to a SLA designation within the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land at 24-26 Darran Road	Risca	Risca West		Residential
E153	Site does not adjoin existing settlement boundary. The road forms the most logical and defensible boundary possible. Also, the land is subject to a VILL designation within the LDP. As a result, no change is deemed necessary. Land north east of Wernddu Row	Risca	Risca West		Residential
E219		Caerphilly	St James		Residential

	Site within existing settlement but boundary being drawn back to the line of the road. As a result, it makes no sense to reinstate a site within this location. No change is deemed necessary.				
D132	Land at Bryngolau Site abuts, but lies outside, existing settlement boundary. It consists of a children's playground and associated car park. Given that the site is in use for recreation, it would not constitute a sustainable inclusion. As a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Rudry	St James		
E244	Twyn Gwyn House, Twyn Gwyn Road Site lies well outside existing settlement boundary within the open countryside and therefore is of no relevance to the settlement boundary review.	Cwmfeinfach	Ynysddu		Residential
E232	Land at Cae'r Llwyn Cottages Site lies well outside existing settlement boundary within the open countryside and therefore is of no relevance to the settlement boundary review.	Pontllanfraith	Ynysddu		Residential
E94	Land at Maindee Road Site does not adjoin existing settlement boundary. Consists of greenfield land. There is no logical reason to expand the boundary to include this site and, as a result, no change is deemed necessary.	Wyllie	Ynysddu		Residential

APPENDIX 2 – EXPERT ASSESSMENT PROFORMAS

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Appendix 2.1 | Initial Planning Assessment Proforma and Explanation Note |
| Appendix 2.2 | Countryside and Landscape Assessment Proforma and Explanation Note |
| Appendix 2.3 | Highways Assessment Proforma and Explanation Note |
| Appendix 2.4 | Environmental Health Proforma and Explanation Note |

Appendix 2.1 Initial Planning Assessment

General Information

Date of Assessment Officer Initials

Grid Reference:

1. Site Name:

2. Site Location:

3. Site Reference No:

4. Site Area (Hectares):

5. Landowner's suggested use:

6. If residential, approximate number of units (density of 35 units/ha)

7. General site description:

UDP Assessment

8. Current UDP policy assessment

Relationship to existing settlement

9a. How does the site relate to the existing settlement?

Location	Y/N	Comments
Within existing settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Rounding off settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Edge of settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Out of settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	

9b. Would this location be acceptable in these terms?

Yes
 No

Sites of National Importance for Biodiversity

10a. Is this site located within or within close proximity to an area of international/national importance for biodiversity?

	No	Close Proximity	Partial Coverage	Whole Coverage
Special Areas of Conservation				
Site of Special Scientific Interest				

Comments:

.....

10b. Is the site acceptable in relation to these designations?

Yes
 No
 Unknown – need further information

Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses

11. Is the proposed land use compatible with neighbouring uses?

Yes
 No

Comment on any potential conflicts:

.....

Flood Risk

12a. Is the site located within a Flood Risk area as defined by TAN 15?

Flood Zone	Y/N	Partial	Complete	Predominant Zoning
Zone A				
Zone B				
Zone C1				
Zone C2				

Comments:

.....

12b. Would the proposed development be acceptable in relation to flood risk? (see guidance notes)

Yes

No

Planning History

13. Does the site or part of the site have any valid planning permissions (please state application number and details)?

App. No	App. Type	Decision	Details

14. Is the applicant's proposed use acceptable?

Yes
No

Justification:

.....
.....
.....
.....

15. Would the site be suitable for the following uses from a planning perspective?
(identify most appropriate)

Use	Y/N	Justification
Residential		
General Industrial (B2/B8)		
Retail		
Mixed Use		
Commercial Leisure		
Community Facilities		
Sport/Leisure		
Office		

Overall Conclusion

16. Is the site acceptable for further consideration as part of the LDP process?

Yes

No

If yes, officer's preferred use

.....

<p>Justification for decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • • •
--

Explanation Note for Initial Planning Assessment Proforma

General Information

In order to maintain an accurate record of the site assessment process, general information on the date of assessment, the initials of the officer undertaking the assessment and the grid reference (8 number) for the site in order to identify the site on the map.

1. Site Name

This is the name that was given to the site upon submission of the site for assessment, based on its location.

2. Site Location

The nearest settlement to the site

3. Site Area

Total site area in hectares

4. Site Reference No.

Reference number and letter allocated to the site

5. Landowners Suggested Use

As part of the landowners consultation, landowners were asked to identify their preferred use for the site. Where sites have been included from other sources residential will be assumed for the land use unless it is specified otherwise.

6. If residential, approximate number of units

Using the density of 35 units per hectare, which has been identified as the average density for development in the County Borough on the basis of applications approved for sites of 10 or more units as recorded in the Joint Housing Land Availability Study, the number of dwellings for the site can be calculated.

7. General site description

This description should include considerations such as whether the site is brownfield or greenfield (if known), whether it is well related to an existing settlement in terms of proximity to services, if it contains any form of development at present (farmhouse, industrial unit, listed building etc), and if it is steeply sloping or flat.

8. Current UDP Policy Assessment

Please indicate the current designation of the site as illustrated in the UDP ie Green Wedge, Housing site, SINC etc. It will also be important to specify whether the site is within or in close proximity to a conservation area or Scheduled Ancient Monument or any other UDP policy allocation. Comment should also be made on whether the site is inside or outside of the existing settlement boundary. Where existing policy designations are identified, comments should be made as to the efficacy of the policy.

9a and b. Relationship to existing settlements

This question refers specifically to how the site relates to the existing settlement. Rather than using the current settlement boundaries as defined in the UDP, asking for a common sense approach should be applied and where a development does about an existing settlement, even though it might be outside our current settlement boundaries that we consider the site as 'edge of settlement'. In addition where a proposed site appears to logically 'round-off' a settlement, 'rounding-off' should be identified as opposed to 'edge of settlement'. 'Out of settlement' and 'within existing settlement' are self-explanatory.

This assessment should be supported by comments and a decision made on whether this location would be acceptable as a Yes or No answer.

10a and b. Sites of national importance for biodiversity that would prohibit development.

There are a number of sites that have been recognised as being nationally important in terms of biodiversity within Caerphilly County Borough, and as a result there will be a strong presumption against development. The County Borough has one Special Area of Conservation and 10 Sites of Special Scientific Interest. It should be noted that there are other levels of national protection such as Special Protection Areas/RAMSAR and National Nature Reserves but there are none of these sites present in the County Borough.

Even if the site is not located within an SSSI or SAC, it may be the case that sites that are directly adjacent to these designations may have an unacceptable impact.

In responding to this question, the amount of land that may impact on the SSSI or SAC should be identified (none, partial or whole) and any additional comment in relation to this assessment should be made.

The Countryside section will provide comments on those environmental designations that are of regional or local importance such as SINCs, sites supporting LBAP Species etc.

A decision needs to be made on whether development would be acceptable in this locality or whether this may be harmful on the SSSIs/SACs. It may be the case that further information needs to be collected on possible impacts.

11. Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses

Environmental Health will be carrying out an in-depth analysis of noise exposure levels / air pollution / contaminated land etc. The general planning assessment does not need to provide a detailed assessment on potential conflict but identify where conflicts may occur, such as residential proposed next to an existing employment site or proximity to a major road. A common-sense approach needs to be adopted based upon professional judgement.

12a and b. Flood Risk

Please indicate where a site falls into a flood risk zone. Where a site is indicated as both C1 and C2 the Environment Agency have confirmed that it should be treated as

a C1 Zone. The amount of the site that is located in each of the flood risk zones should be identified if appropriate.

The Figure below gives a description of zones:

Figure 1

Description of Zone		Use within the precautionary framework
Considered to be at little or no risk of fluvial or tidal/coastal flooding.	A	Used to indicate that justification test is not applicable and no need to consider flood risk further.
Areas known to have been flooded in the past evidenced by sedimentary deposits.	B	Used as part of a precautionary approach to indicate where site levels should be checked against the extreme (0.1%) flood level. If site levels are greater than the flood levels used to define adjacent extreme flood outline there is no need to consider flood risk further.
Based on Environment Agency extreme flood outline, equal to or greater than 0.1% (river, tidal or coastal)	C	Used to indicate that flooding issues should be considered as an integral part of decision making by the application of the justification test including assessment of consequences.
Areas of the floodplain which are developed and served by significant infrastructure, including flood defences.	C1	Used to indicate that development can take place subject to application of justification test, including acceptability of consequences.
Areas of the floodplain without significant flood defence infrastructure.	C2	Used to indicate that only less vulnerable development should be considered subject to application of justification test, including acceptability of consequences. Emergency services and highly vulnerable development should not be considered.

Figure 2 needs to be given consideration in relation to the proposed use suggested for the site. For instance, residential development is considered 'highly vulnerable' therefore it should not be considered in a C2 Flood risk zone. A decision in relation to this should be made to identify whether the proposed development would be acceptable in relation to these designations.

Welsh Assembly Government (2004) **Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk**

13. Planning History

If the site has been subject to a recent relevant planning application, recent consultations would have been undertaken and can be used in identifying possible constraints. For the purposes of this field, the application number, date of application and brief details should be noted on all applications submitted on a site since 1996. Where part of the identified site only has been subject to this application, this should be specified.

14. Suitability of the applicants preferred use

As a result of the answers to the previous questions, a recommendation should be made on whether the applicant's proposed use is acceptable and the justification for why this decision has been made.

15. Preferred Uses

It may be the case that sites are not suitable for the use proposed by the landowner but may be suitable for another use. This question aims to identify all possible land uses that the site may be suitable for and justification for this decision.

16. Overall Conclusion

This is intended to raise the most pertinent points in relation to rejecting / recommending a site for its suggested use. Where an officer feels that the suggested use of the site is inappropriate, the officer should recommend an appropriate use as identified in the preferred uses appraisal. A decision should be made on the basis of this information to identify whether the site is acceptable for further consideration as part of the LDP process and justification for this.

If the site is considered acceptable, it will be subject to further consideration in relation to Countryside, Environmental Health and Highways. However, if no uses are identified as appropriate, the site will be ruled out as unsuitable in planning terms and no further assessment will be made.

Appendix 2.2 Countryside And Landscape Assessment

General site information

1. Site Name:
.....
.....
2. Site Location:
.....
.....
3. Grid Reference
4. Site Reference No.
5. Site Area:
6. Type of development proposed:
7. General site description:

Landscape Assessment

8. Is the site on the register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historical Interest in Wales?

YES NO

(Mark extent of site on the plan provided)

9a) Is the site listed on the register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest

YES NO

b) Does the Site lie within the Essential Setting of a site of Special Historic Interest?

YES NO

(Mark extent of site on the plan provided)

10. What Grade has the site been designated in Landscape Value on Land Map?

Low Moderate High Outstanding

11. Does the site lie within a Special Landscape Area on the Unitary Development Plan

YES NO

12. Does the site lie within a Green Wedge on the Unitary Development Plan

YES NO

13. Does the site contain woodland?

YES NO

14. Is the site listed on the Register of Ancient Woodland?

YES NO

Ancient Semi natural

Ancient Replanted

(Mark extent on plan provided)

15. Does the site contain trees?

YES NO

16. Does the site contain trees with Tree Preservation Orders?

YES NO

(Mark TPO trees on plan provided)

17. Are there existing trees and woodlands worthy of retention and protection by a Tree Preservation Order?

YES NO

18. Does the site contain Ancient /Veteran Trees?

(Mark Ancient/Veteran Trees on plan provided)

YES NO

19. Does the site contain hedgerows? YES NO

Have any been identified as Important under the Hedgerow Regs?
YES NO

(Mark hedgerows and Important hedgerows on plan provided)

20. Summary of Landscape Constraints

21. Are Landscape constraints significant enough to prevent development of:

The whole site? YES NO

Part of the site? YES NO

(Identify parts of the site that should be excluded from development)

22. What additional landscape surveys/ assessments will be required for this site?

Biodiversity Assessment

23. Is the site within or adjacent to an International or European Designated Site?
 (Special Protection Area, RAMSAR Site or Special Area of Conservation)
 (*Underline the relevant designation*)

Within	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adjacent to	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

(*Mark extent of site on plan provided*)

24. Is the site within or adjacent to a Nationally Designated Site?
 (National Nature Reserve or Site of Special Scientific Interest)
 (*Underline the relevant designation*)

Within	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adjacent to	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

(*Mark extent of site on plan provided*)

25. Is the site within a Locally Designated Site?
 (Local Nature Reserve or Site of Importance for Nature Conservation)
 (*Underline the relevant designation*)

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

(*Mark extent of site on plan provided*)

26. Are there records of European Protected Species for this site?
 (Bats, Otters, Dormice and Great Crested Newts)

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

List Species

27. Are there records for species protected under UK legislation (not included above)?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

List Species

28. Are there records for UK or Wales Priority Species or Habitats (not included above)?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

List Species
and/or Habitats

29. Are there records for Caerphilly LBAP Species or Habitats (not included above)?

YES NO

List Species
and/or Habitats

30. With regard to questions 25 to 28, does the site support habitat suitable for supporting protected species?

YES NO

List the habitat and potential species below:

Habitat	Potential Species

31. Does the site contain "stepping stones" or wildlife corridors (not included above)

YES NO

32. Summary of Biodiversity Constraints

33.

The whole site? YES NO

Part of the site? YES NO

(Identify parts of the site that should be excluded from development)

34. What additional ecological surveys/ assessments will be required for this site?

Additional comments / observations:

Landscape Assessment

Landscape encompasses a variety of settings and backdrops within the County Borough including land between villages and towns, urban fringe, steep sided valleys, mountain top plateaus and the more traditional areas of agricultural fields. Whilst these are landscapes associated with the rural environment, it is important to remember that landscape also applies to the urban environment where amenity interests, and green spaces within settlement limits are a significant resource.

Trees, woodland and hedgerows make a positive and beneficial contribution to both the natural and built environment. They provide visual screening, noise barriers, separation, human scale to development and a setting within the wider environment. They are also extremely important for biodiversity and the benefits to human health of trees woodlands and accessible green space being increasingly recognised. The retention of trees, woodlands and hedgerows is therefore vital. Development and land use changes should, wherever possible not adversely affect, directly or indirectly, the integrity or continuity of hedgerows, linear tree belts or woodland.

8. *Is the site on the register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historical Interest in Wales?*

The Register of Historic Landscapes of Wales refers to landscapes, which carry physical evidence of past ages from the agricultural landscapes of the prehistoric period to the industrial landscapes of the 19th century, and even the technological landscapes of the 20th century.

Development within or affecting Landscapes of Outstanding Historical Interest should not have a harmful impact upon the character, historical or aesthetic value of the landscape. Where development does take place, provision should be made for the continued protection of the historical interest of the landscape.

9a) Is the site listed on the register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest

b) Does the Site lie within the Essential Setting of a site of Special Historic Interest?

The register of Landscapes, Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales, include landscapes in towns and cities, which became so important as urban populations swelled in the 19th century, to those of the rural estate. All of the landscapes within the register of Landscapes, Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historical Interest have borrowed the scenery of Wales to create an aesthetically satisfying sense of place.

Development within or affecting Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest or the essential setting of a site of Special Historic Interest should not have a harmful impact upon the character, historical or aesthetic value of the landscape. Where development does take place, provision should be made for the continued protection of the historical interest of the landscape.

10. What Grade has the site been designated in Landscape Value on Land Map?

LANDMAP is produced by the Countryside Council for Wales and strongly endorsed by the Welsh Assembly Government. It was first published in 2001 and has now been implemented by all Local Authorities in Wales. LANDMAP is a specially devised national landscape information system. It gathers, organises and evaluates information about landscape into a nationally consistent data set. LANDMAP records the nature, condition and importance of particular qualities.

The 2001 information divided the information between 5 aspects layers;

- *Geological Landscape*: The study of the geology, geomorphology and hydrology of the area
- *Landscape Habitats*: Looks at the distribution of vegetation and habitats and the basis for landscape ecology
- *Visual & Sensory*: Identifies the landscape qualities that are perceived through the senses, visual patterns for example
- *Historic Landscape*: Focuses on how archaeological and historical sites relate to each other and to the surrounding landscape
- *Cultural Landscape*: Considers the relationship that exists between people and places and how this has shaped the landscape.

Each aspect layer has been awarded a grade based on the importance of the qualities within the area. They are assessed as follows;

- *Outstanding*: of international or national importance to the aspect
- *High*: of regional or county importance to the aspect
- *Moderate*: of local importance to the Aspect

- *Low*: of little or no importance to the Aspect

Please note that the 2001 layers were updated in 2004, however due to technical difficulties accessing the information and incomplete data sets we have decided to continue to use the 2001 data.

11. *Does the site lie within a Special Landscape Area on the Unitary Development Plan?*

Special Landscape Areas (SLA) are designated to protect those areas which are considered to be important to the overall landscape of Caerphilly CBC, in terms of their intrinsic value and by virtue of the contribution the landscape makes in terms of the visual setting of towns, villages and the historic environment. Whilst SLA's are not designated to preclude development, development that would harm the historic or rural setting of the County Borough is not permitted, including the landscape setting in relation to the significant views in relation to the rural backdrop of an area and on the skyline.

12. *Does the site lie within a Green Wedge on the Unitary Development Plan?*

The council consider there is a need to define and maintain open spaces within urban areas and gaps of open countryside between settlements. Within green wedges, it is intended that an open nature should be maintained by permitting development that is associated with agriculture, forestry, recreation or other uses that involve no substantial new buildings.

Any proposal for development that would erode or destroy the open nature of the green wedge should be resisted. Measures that encourage, sustain and improve the contribution to the environment of the urban fringe will be encouraged.

13. *Does the site contain woodland?*

Woodlands are of great importance both as wildlife habitats and in terms of their contribution to landscape character and beauty. Local Authorities have a legal duty to preserve trees and woodlands under Section 197 (General duties of Local Planning Authorities in respect of Trees) of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. As such, LPA's should seek to protect areas of woodland, both in the built and natural environment, where they have natural heritage value, biodiversity or contribute to the character or amenity of a particular location.

Any development that would require the removal of whole or part of a woodland and would result, therefore in the visual or amenity harm to the woodland, wildlife habitat or visual and amenity value of the immediate or surrounding area should be resisted.

14. *Is the site listed on the Register of Ancient Woodland?*

Ancient woodlands are those occupying sites, which have been wooded continuously for at least 400 hundred years. They are irreplaceable, our richest habitats for wildlife and reservoirs of historical information. Ancient woodland is not a statutory designation and the wood does not have any legal protection. In Britain, ancient woods over two hectares in size are mostly recorded on ancient woodland inventories, or a register.

Whilst ancient woodlands may not have the benefit of legal protection, they are increasingly enjoying recognition and protection through national, regional and local

planning policies. Any development that could damage the fragile woodland ecosystem or threaten the long-term survival or conservation value of an ancient wood should be resisted.

15. Does the site contain trees?

As with woodlands, trees form a significant and vital component of the environment that we live in. Local Authorities have a legal duty to preserve trees and woodlands under Section 197 (General duties of Local Planning Authorities in respect of Trees) of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. As such, LPA's should seek to protect trees. As such, the retention of quality trees both in the urban and rural fabric is sought by the LPA.

16. Does the site contain trees with Tree Preservation Orders?

The Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 empowers the Council to protect trees in the interest of public amenity by making Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's), which bring under the control of the LPA the damage, felling, lopping etc of specified trees and woodlands. The Council will also seek to make TPO's to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would have a significant impact on the environment and its enjoyment by the public.

Development would be resisted where there would be a significant impact upon a Tree Preservation Order in order to protect the tree/s or woodlands and the integrity of the environment.

17. Are there existing trees and woodlands worthy of retention and protection by a Tree Preservation Order?

The Local Planning Authority will continue to make Tree Preservation Orders under the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 where appropriate to protect trees and woodlands that are under threat and where the amenity value is high. Any development that could potentially cause harm to or threaten the future of any tree/s or woodland that are considered worthy of retention or protection under a Tree preservation Order will be resisted. This is to try and protect sound existing trees, which contribute positively to the immediate and surrounding environment.

18. Does the site contain Ancient /Veteran Trees?

An ancient or veteran tree is difficult to define precisely and will vary dramatically between species. However, they are broadly defined as "Trees that are of interest biologically, aesthetically, or culturally because of their age". Generally they will also have passed any commercial life-span and maybe in decline. However, it is important to note that a declining tree does not mean that a tree is dangerous or is has no environmental benefit. Ancient trees have no legal protection unless a Tree Preservation Order covers them.

Due care and consideration should be awarded to the continued conservation and protection of ancient trees. The retention of ancient trees would be sought on any development site. The removal of ancient trees would be resisted in the interest of biodiversity, cultural, historical or aesthetic values.

19. Does the site contain hedgerows?

Have any been identified as Important under the Hedgerow Regs?

Hedgerows are important for wildlife and the landscape. They help to prevent soil erosion and water run-off, they shelter and control livestock and protect crops from wind. Hedgerows have been a significant feature of the British landscape for centuries, but recent trends have seen the removal and dereliction of hedgerows increasing at an alarming rate.

In order to protect hedgerows, The Hedgerow Regulations, 1997 were implemented under Section 97 of the Environment Act 1995. The regulations state that the removal of hedgerows requires the submission of a hedgerow removal notice to the Local Planning Authorities. There is also a list of criteria that determines which hedgerows are 'important'. The LPA has the authority to order the retention of any hedgerow identified as 'important' under the Regulations. Hedgerows qualifying as "important" are material considerations in the development control process. The presumption of the Regulations is in favour of protecting and retaining all "important" hedgerows, and only to allow their removal in certain exceptional circumstances. The LPA therefore has to be able to justify the loss of important hedgerows against the list of "exceptional circumstances" within the Regulations.

Where hedgerows have been surveyed under the Regulations, through notification by a landowner or as part of a planning application, this information remains on a register. Information on hedgerows qualifying as "important" as a result of previous surveys will be accessible and applied to the LDP site assessment process.

20. Summary of Landscape Constraints

21. Are Landscape constraints significant enough to prevent development of:

Having taken into consideration the presence of Landscapes of Outstanding Historical Interest in Wales, Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, LANDMAP values, Special Landscape Areas, Green Wedges, Woodlands, Trees, Hedgerows, Ancient woodlands and trees and Tree Preservation Orders an assessment will then be made on the impact development could potentially have upon the landscape value of part or the whole site. If it is considered that the potential impacts would endanger or threaten the landscape value or amenity and there is no potential for mitigation, then it is likely that the landscape constraints will be considered significant enough to prevent development of the site.

Please note that development will not be refused purely on the basis of either the Special Landscape Area or the Green Wedge due to their background as a Unitary Development Plan.

22. What additional landscape surveys/ assessments will be required for this site?

Depending upon the results of the site assessments, further additional information maybe required. This information may take the form of the following surveys for example;

(a) Tree Survey including;

- A detailed site survey at 1:200.
- An arboricultural report in accordance with BS 5837.

(b) Hedgerow Survey

(c) Landscape Assessment – This would be particularly important when the LANDMAP value identifies a low value, but a site visit by the landscape architect identifies a potentially important landscape value.

Biodiversity Assessment

Caerphilly County Borough Council is rich in wildlife and this is reflected by the range of designated sites within the County Borough that are recognised to be of European, UK and local importance. In order to assess the suitability of land for development, the relative value of the biodiversity of each site needs to be given full consideration. Information used for assessment will be gathered from existing knowledge, CCBC held data and information held by the South East Wales Biodiversity Record Centre.

23. *Is the site within or adjacent to an International or European Designated Site? (Special Protection Area [SPA], RAMSAR Site or Special Area of Conservation [SAC])*

Special Protection Areas are classified under Article 4 of the EC Directive on Conservation of Wild Birds (79/409/EEC)(The Birds Directive), RAMSAR sites are listed under the convention on wetlands of International Importance (RAMSAR Convention, 1971) and Special Areas of Conservation are designated under the EC Directive on the conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora & Fauna (92/43/EEC) (The Habitats Directive). There is a strong presumption against developments within or in the immediate vicinity of the above designations. Where development is within or in the immediate vicinity of a SAC, SPA or a RAMSAR site, the local planning authority (LPA) are required to undertake an appropriate assessment, which includes the cumulative affects of a proposal, together with other developments in the area on the protected area.

Caerphilly County Borough Council currently has one Special Area of Conservation (Aberbargoed Grasslands) and no Special Protection Areas or RAMSAR sites.

24. *Is the site within or adjacent to a Nationally Designated Site? (National Nature Reserve or Site of Special Scientific Interest)*

National Nature Reserves (NNRs) are declared under Section 35 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and Sites of Special of Scientific Interest are notified under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

NNRs are managed solely for their nature conservation value and represent the highest quality Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). There are currently no National Nature reserves within Caerphilly County Borough Council.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest are designated to identify and give protection to areas, which are considered to be of national importance in terms of biodiversity and geological features. Caerphilly County Borough Council has 10 SSSIs, and there is a presumption against development within a SSSI unless the primary purpose of the development is to benefit the nature conservation interest of the site.

25. *Is the site within a Locally Designated Site? (Local Nature Reserve or Site of Importance for Nature Conservation)*

Local Nature Reserves (LNR) are declared under Section 21 of the National Parks & Access to the Countryside Act, 1949 and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) identify areas that are of local nature conservation interest. These include a wide variety of habitats and seek to ensure that local natural heritage remains as large and as diverse as possible. The local authority designates both LNRs and SINC.

Local Nature Reserves and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation should be retained where possible unless the proposed allocation can demonstrate no suitable alternative and no overriding public need for the development. Where overriding need is demonstrated, measures to mitigate for the loss of habitat and/or species will always be required.

There are currently 188 SINC and 4 LNRs within Caerphilly County Borough Council.

**26. Are there records of European Protected Species for this site?
(Bats, Otters, Dormice and Great Crested Newts)**

Under the EEC Habitats Directive 79/409/EEC (Conservation of wild birds) and 92/43/EEC (Conservation of natural habitats and wild flora and fauna), which have been translated into UK legislation by the Conservation (Natural Habitats, etc.) Regulations 1994, a number of species have been identified for protection due to their rarity. Caerphilly county borough is known to support bats (all species), European otter, dormouse and great crested newt, which are all protected under the habitats directive and are known as European Protected Species (EPS).

Any site allocation known to support one or more of these European Protected Species will need to apply the three tests outlined in the Habitats Directive. The three tests are as follows;

- 1). that there is no satisfactory alternative;
- 2). It will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in the natural range;
- 3). It is in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment.

Where development is likely to have an adverse impact upon European Protected Species there will be a strong presumption against development. In all other cases mitigation will have to be approved by the County Ecologist. Any site identified that has or is in close proximity to European Protected Species will need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey, which should contain details of mitigation proposals.

27. Are there records for species protected under UK legislation (not included above)?

Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (and subsequent amendments) 1981, a number of species are protected in addition to those protected under the EEC Habitats Directive. UK protected species are a material consideration in reference to

the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. As such, the presence of a UK protected species may be constraint to development. Any development taking place on a site on a site with known UK protected species present should always aim to accommodate the requirements of the protected species.

28. *Are there records for UK or Wales Priority Species or Habitats (not included above)?*

Biodiversity – The UK Action Plan (1994) was one of the UK’s responses to the Rio Earth Summit (1992) and set out the broad strategy for conserving and enhancing wild species and habitats in the UK. A steering group was set up and a report published in 1995 which identified 431 species action plans and 45 habitat action plans, these are referred to as UK Priority Species or Habitats.

All species and habitats identified as a UK or Wales Priority should be protected from development where possible and alternative sites sought inline with national targets set out in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Where development does take place, it should always aim to accommodate the identified priority species or habitats within the site.

In 2000, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act became law in England and Wales. This was a significant piece of legislation and part of the Act, Section 74, placed a duty upon the National Assembly for Wales to have regard, in exercising its functions, to conserve biological diversity in accordance with the UN Convention on Biological Diversity. In addition, Section 74(2) required the publication of a list of species and habitats that the Assembly considers to be of principal importance for that purpose. During the passage of the CROW Act through Parliament, the UK Environment Minister made it clear that this was to provide statutory underpinning to the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Section 74(3) places a responsibility on the Assembly to take, or to promote the taking of others of, such steps as appears to the Assembly to be reasonably practicable, to further the conservation of the species and habitats included in the published list. This list comprises the Wales priority species and habitats referred to in this section of the proforma.**29.** *Are there records for Caerphilly Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAP) Species or Habitats (not included above)?*

Whilst the CROW Act 2000 duty remains on the National Assembly for Wales, the Assembly expects that the focus of action for the listed species and habitats will be through the preparation and implementation of Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) in partnerships. Local Planning Authorities in developing their Unitary Development Plans should be adopting LBAPs as Supplementary Planning Guidance (paragraph 5.4.2 “Planning Policy Wales” March 2002) and they must take account of biodiversity considerations in determining individual planning applications.

Local Biodiversity Action Plans are the principle mechanism by which the UK Biodiversity Action Plan can be translated into effective action at the local level. The Biodiversity Action Plan for Caerphilly County Borough was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance in January 2005. LBAP’s are intended to focus resources to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the local area by setting targets and actions for characteristic species and habitats.

Habitats and species in this category are of local distinctiveness to Caerphilly county borough and valued by the residents of the area. Any allocations that impact on these species or habitats should ensure that mitigation measures are put in place to ensure there is no net biodiversity loss in the local area.

30. *With regard to questions 25 to 28, does the site support habitat suitable for supporting protected species?*

List the habitat and potential species below:

Habitat	Potential Species

This section has been included to highlight where there is the potential for protected species, even though there no current records are held for them at the Biodiversity Records Centre. This is important to ensure that all protected species are considered at an early stage of the development plan process to inform future ecological surveys and mitigation, as necessary, particularly in relation to habitat likely to support European Protected Species.

31. *Does the site contain “stepping stones” or wildlife corridors (not included above)*

Stepping-stones or wildlife corridors are usually linear habitats comprising of trees and shrubs, grasslands and other semi-natural habitats for example. They often occur on agricultural land (e.g. hedgerows and woodlands), along disused railway lines or rivers. They are very important for the movement of species through what would otherwise be open terrain and can also act in the interests of plant dispersal.

Some land allocations may include key stepping-stones or corridors for movements of species. Whilst this should not preclude the allocation of the land, the stepping-stones and corridors should be clearly identified and if necessary excluded from overall area calculations for available site usage within the land allocation. If existing wildlife corridors or stepping-stones cannot be retained, alternatives should be provided.

Where there are large areas of habitat affected by a site proposal, which connects up other habitats in the landscape, then this may be considered to be a significant impact on the movement of species, for example, as flight lines for bats (European Protected Species). The retention of such wildlife corridors should be a priority, particularly if protected species are on or near the site in question, and possible enhancement should be considered. Or, where alternative/replacement habitats are put in place by way of mitigation, these should also seek to improve the current situation.

32. *Summary of Biodiversity Constraints*

33. *Are Biodiversity constraints significant enough to prevent development of:*

Having taken into consideration the presence of EEC protected species, UK protected species, UK, Wales or Caerphilly LBAP priority species or habitats, sites containing EEC designated sites, National Nature Reserves, Sites of Special Scientific Interest Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation or Local Nature Reserves, an assessment will then be made on the impact the development could potentially have upon the site and its biodiversity value. If the biodiversity value of the

whole or part of the site is endangered or threatened as a result of development, and there is no potential for mitigation, then it is likely that the biodiversity constraints will be considered significant enough to prevent development.

34. *What additional ecological surveys/ assessments will be required for this site?*

Where there is inadequate information on a site and there is the potential for any of the biodiversity factors raised to be present or affected by the allocation of a site for development, the additional information may be requested;

(a) Ecological Surveys to include European Protected Species (Bat, Barn Owl, Great Crested Newts or Otter surveys), which would be required as part of any future planning application, or other protected species that should also be considered, for example reptiles and breeding birds, etc.

(b) Mitigation Reports where protected species are discovered to mitigate for the loss of habitat within the development of the site or off site compensation, etc.

Appendix 2.3 Highways Assessment

General site information

Site Name:

Site Location:

Site Reference No. _____

Site Area: _____

Type of development proposed: _____

General site description:

Potential impact on existing highway network resulting from the proposed development

1. Estimated Trip generation as result of development:
 - a. Estimated number of units on site (residential use only): _____
 - b. Estimated trip generation (if residential – per unit/24hr): _____
 - c. Estimated Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) generated by the development:
_____ Trips/24hr.
 - d. Estimated hours of peak flow: _____ AM _____ PM

2. Observations of existing Highway infrastructure to which new access / egress will adjoin:
 - a. Estimated current Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT):
_____ Trips/24hr.
 - b. Provide detailed description of existing highway conditions: (e.g. Evidence of operational, topographical, environmental and safety issues that exist on both the local and wider road network).

Observations

3. To what extent would the use of this land for the stated purpose impact on the existing highway network in terms of traffic generation?

Estimated increase in vehicular trips on existing network as a result of the development:

- a. Estimated increase in total number of trips made: (Use estimated AADT in Q.1c)

- b. What is the estimated percentage increase of vehicular trips on the existing highway network as a result of the traffic generated by the development?

$$\frac{\text{Estimated increase in total number of trips}}{\text{Estimated current Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)}} \times 100 = \text{_____} \%$$

- c. Does traffic to and from the development exceed 10% of the two way flow on the adjoining highway?

YES –Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) recommended

NO

- d. Does the traffic flow to and from the development exceed 5% of the two-way flow on the adjoining highway where congestion exists?

YES – Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) recommended

NO

4. What implications would this increase in vehicular traffic have on the existing highway network in terms of both creating and or exacerbating existing network problems? (As listed in Q.2b)

Please list all operational, topographical and safety issues:

5. Are there any other candidate LDP development sites in the area that may in conjunction with this one, have a collective negative impact on the surrounding highway network?

YES

NO

If yes, please specify site name and implications:

6. Having considered the aforementioned, would you consider the negative impact on the existing network as a result of this development, to be at a level that will require major capacity improvement works in the short to medium future through a Section 106 Planning Agreement.

YES

NO

Accessibility onto existing highway network

7. Is there an existing access to the site:

8. Is the existing access(s) and road it adjoins (i.e. if private drive, farm lane etc) adequate to facilitate the movement of traffic generated by the development? (Refer to Q.1c&e for projected trip generation).

YES NO

9. Provide general description of existing access point(s) and road? (Mark on plan).

10. Considering the area of the development and the proposed use, how many access points would be recommended? (Mark preferred access point(s) on plan provided).

Number of access points recommended =

11. If a new access or accesses were required to the site, onto what hierarchy of road would it/they have to adjoin?

Core network	<input type="checkbox"/>	County route	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distributor route	<input type="checkbox"/>	Access road	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: (Please specify) _____

12. What is the potential of physically providing a new access point(s) onto the existing highway network: (Please 'X' appropriate box for each access point).

Easy access obtainable to existing Highway	<input type="checkbox"/>
Relatively easy access obtainable, although some constraints present	<input type="checkbox"/>
Difficult to provide access to site due to numerous constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access cannot be provided due to severity of constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Provide a general description of each potential access point and 'X' appropriate box to indicate severity of existing constraints: (Please clearly reference each proposed point of access with plan).

Access (a):

14. Would a Section 278 Highway Agreement be required to help facilitate access to the site?

YES

NO

Recommendation:

Please 'X' appropriate box and provide a summary explanation for recommendation:

Site **IS** suitable to be developed for its intended purpose.

Brief reason for recommendation:

Site is **NOT** suitable to be developed for its intended purpose.

Brief reason for recommendation:

General site information

This section is to be completed by using the information provided by the Planning Division and is located at the front of their assessment proforma that is attached to each site plan. The information provides a general overview of the site including its location, size, number of proposed units (residential), reference number, existing and proposed usage (note: highway assessment to consider Planning Officers recommendation for development type and **NOT** landowners recommendation) as well as a general description of site conditions.

Potential impact on existing highway infrastructure resulting from the proposed development

The allocation of land for development will, depending on its proposed use, have a varying level of impact on the surrounding highway infrastructure. It is therefore important to try and foresee what the potential impact each type and size of development may have on the existing network hierarchy.

Using a trip generation database (TRICS) to provide traffic flow data for varying types and sizes of development it is possible to estimate the level of traffic likely to be generated as a result of a proposed development.

Q. 1a – The number of units is dependant on the site area, using the known site area the Planning Division will provide the estimated number of units to be built on the

site. The number of units will only be given when considering residential developments.

Q. 2b – This is again dependent on the proposed development type. When considering residential developments you can expect the following number of trips per unit:

Residential use – 8 trips per unit/24hr period

However, to determine the number of trips generated as a result of the following development types you must consider the land area and proposed use of the site and not number of units as per residential sites. The Consultant is required to consult with Highways Planning and the TRICS database when considering trips levels for the following development types:

- Sports/Leisure use
- Mixed use
- Office use
- Industrial use
- Retail use

Q. 1c – To determine the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) generated by a residential development, the following calculation can be performed. However to establish the AADT of other development types (such as above) you are required to consult the TRICS database.

Estimated No. of trips per unit x No. of proposed units on site = AADT

Q. 1 d&e – The estimated hours of peak flow will be provided by the TRIC'S database (see Highways Planning).

Q. 2a – This will give an idea of the existing two-way flow on the adjoining highway. To calculate the estimated traffic flow on the existing highway the consultant is required to:

Conduct an off peak (after 9.00am and before 4.00pm) 10 minute two way count of the traffic flow on the highway. Then carry out the following calculation:

Total vehicles counted x 100 = AADT (Vehicular trips per 24hr period)

Q. 2b – The consultant is required to observe and record site observations in relation to operational, topographical, and environmental issues as well as any safety hazards that might exist on the existing road network.

Q. 3a – Use figure determined in question Q. 1c.

Q. 3b – This calculation will be used to determine the percentage increase of vehicular trips on the existing network as a direct result of the development. This is determined by using the following calculation:

Estimated increase in total number of trips x 100 = % increase in vehicular trips

Estimated current Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)

The 'Estimated increase in total number of trips' is determined from Q. 3a and the 'Estimated current Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is taken from Q. 2a.

Q. 3 c&d – Will be determined by the percentage given in Q. 3b. The percentage increase in traffic flow on the existing network will establish whether it may be advisable to request a Traffic Impact Assessment prior to the development of the site or not. The determination levels are in accordance with IHT guidance.

Q. 4 – Is the potential increase in traffic generated by the development likely to impact on existing or create new operational or topographical problems on the highway. Capacity and highway safety issues to be considered.

Q. 5 – The consultant will be required to observe the spatial plan indicating the location of all the candidate LDP development sites in the Borough. The consultant is required to assess whether there will be a collective impact on the network as a result of several developments accessing the same distributor route, access road, roundabout etc.

Sites of concern to be listed and potential implications to highway network stated, for example potential capacity, road safety problems etc.

The spatial plans are GIS based and can be loaded onto Map Viewer/Arcview from the M:drive at the following location(s):

- M:/Planning/LDP/draft/landowner sites.
- M:/Planning/LDP/draft/potential housing sites

It would be best to overlay both of the above themes to identify where adjacent sites have been submitted.

Q. 6 – This question considers the impact of the proposed increase in traffic generated by the proposed development and whether any works to the existing network carried out via a Section 106 Planning Agreement would be required to allow for the expected increase in traffic levels on the surrounding network.

Accessibility onto the existing highway network

An assessment of existing and potential access points to the development site is required. Whilst it is accepted that most sites may be made physically accessible at a cost, it is important to recognise what constraints may inhibit this and the potential difficulties that must be overcome.

Q. 7 – Asks whether the site can be accessed by vehicles from the existing highway.

Q. 8 – A site may currently be accessible from the highway, however the current access may not be suitable for the proposed development use. The current access may be narrow, un-surfaced etc and form part of a private drive or access lane before joining with the public highway some distance away. It is therefore necessary to consider the existing access and whether it is suitable to handle the volume of traffic generated by the development (use trip generation figures from Q. 1 c&e). Factors to be considered are access visibility, width, alignments, type of road, lane the access exits onto and its width, class, usage, purpose etc.

Q. 9 – The consultant is required to provide a general description of the existing access point(s) to the site, considering the above factors. Existing access points are to be referenced on a plan and accompanied by photographs.

Q. 10 – The number of access/egress points required to the site is dependant on the size of the development and when considering residential developments the number of units present.

For example under most circumstances, good practice states that a residential development will have one access/egress point for every 300 units on site.

Q. 11 – An important factor that must be considered when assessing potential new access points is Caerphilly C. B. C's road hierarchy. The road hierarchy (as set out in the Local Transport Plan) is defined as consisting of a Core Network, County Routes, Distributor Routes and Access roads.

Mark the appropriate box(s) for each potential access/egress point required.

The purpose of this hierarchy is to facilitate the efficient use of the highway network and control what transport and development access arrangements may be permitted at what point on the highway. (These controls are defined in the Unitary Development Plan 2003).

Using these controls may determine the suitability of a development. For example direct access from a site onto the Core Network is not considered acceptable under the terms set out in the UDP, therefore where you have a site that's only potential access point is onto the Core Network the current guidance will not allow the development to proceed unless under exceptional circumstances.

Q. 12 - The potential to access a site has been graded into four categories of difficulty depending on existing constraints. The consultant must use his/her judgement to assess the potential of providing a suitable access while considering the severity of constraint that may influence access to the site:

1. Easy access obtainable to existing highway
2. Relatively easy access obtainable, although some constraints present
3. Difficult to provide access to site due to numerous constraints
4. Access cannot be provided due to severity of constraints

Q. 13 – The consultant is required to provide a written description of each potential access point to the site, listing observations regarding topography, alignments, visibility, land ownership issues (site landlocked, ransom strips etc) and layout. The consultant is also asked to 'X' the appropriate box to indicate level of severity of constraints effecting potential access to the site. For example the site may be bound on 3 sides by a river and the Core Network on the other, therefore access to the site would be severely restricted.

Each access point is to be clearly crossed referenced between the proforma and the provided plan. Photographs are also to be provided.

Q. 14 – A developer and Highway Authority may, if required, enter into a Section 278 Highway Agreement to allow for the execution of works to the highway to allow access to a development site.

The consultant must envisage whether alterations to the existing highway (i.e. widening of existing junction, layout changes, provision of a roundabout, left/right turning lanes, footway changes etc) may be necessary to allow access to the site and therefore whether a Section 278 Highway Agreement will be required to facilitate these works.

Recommendation

The consultant is required to use the evidence that has been collected for the completion of the proforma to determine whether a site 'is' or 'is not' suitable for the proposed development.

The consultant is required to mark an 'X' in the appropriate box and provide a brief summary referencing evidence in the proforma that supports the final decision.

Appendix 2.4 Environmental Health

Environmental Health - Local Development Plan Site Assessments			
General			
	Officer's Name		
	Date of Assessment		
<u>General site information</u>			
Site Name			
Site Location			
Site Reference No			
Site Area (Ha)			
Type of development proposed			
Are there any neighbouring LDP development sites that may, in conjunction with this one, have a negative impact? (Y/N)			
Is Yes, please specify site reference(s)			
<u>Criteria</u>			
1. Odour			
		None	
		Potential Odour Nuisance	
Officer's Comments			
2. Light			
		None	
		Potential Light Nuisance	
Officer's Comments			

3. Noise			
Commercial/Industrial			
Traffic			
Mixed			
Other			
None			
Officer's Comments			
None			
BS4142 Type Assessment Required			
TAN 11 Assessment Required			
Both Assessments Required			
Noise Assessment Required			
4. Waste			
		None	
		Potential Waste Nuisance	
Officer's Comments			
5. Contamination			
		None	
		Ground investigation and	
		risk asesment required in	
		accordance with current	
		DEFRA guidance (using	
		CLEA Model) and having	

		regard to CLR 7 TO 11	
Officer's Comments			
SUMMARY			
Site is suitable for intended purpose			
Further information is required prior to a decision on whether site is suitable for its intended purpose			
Details of Further Information Required to be Submitted			
Site is not suitable for intended purpose			
Brief reason for recommendation			
Consideration of Alternative Proposed Use			
Residential			
General Industrial	B2 General Industry (not offices)		
	B8 Warehousing/Storage		
Offices			
Mixed Use			
Retail			
Commercial Leisure eg cinemas			
Sport and Recreation eg playing pitches			
Approved By			

Explanatory Notes for Environmental Health Proforma

In assessing the sites for the Local Development Plan, the Environmental Health department has given consideration to the potential future use of each site in terms of their impact on neighbouring developments. The possible impacts of odour nuisance, light nuisance, noise nuisance, the impact of waste and the possible effects of contaminated land have been considered. The following notes expand on the potential aforementioned effects and aim to put into context the reasoning for the selection of the preferred end use of the sites under consideration.

1. Odour Nuisance

Complaints to the environmental health department about odour constitutes a significant proportion of the total complaints received each year. Odour complaints arise from a variety of sources ranging from cooking smells, the keeping of livestock, animal by-products and meat processing operations and chemical plants to name just a few. Most complaints about odour relate to the annoyance about the smells affecting the enjoyment of homes and gardens, or making working conditions unpleasant. Odour intensity or strength can be difficult to measure and can also be subjective in nature, offending some people more than others. The frequency of the odour occurring can also affect the way in which it is perceived by the recipient, as can the duration and the time of day it occurs. Offensive odours are not necessarily unpleasant in nature; the smell of perfume or other fragrance can become offensive if its frequency and duration is such that it is persistent in nature in a residential area.

The importance of the consideration of odour for the purpose of the local development plan site assessment should not be underestimated because it can be difficult to control after the odorous process, plant or activity has been granted permission to operate. Whilst legislative controls are effective, the process of gathering sufficient evidence to begin legal proceedings can be lengthy and the costs to the operator in remedial measures can be onerous. To reduce the impact of odour on residential properties, the siting of commercial or industrial premises must be carefully considered and avoided wherever possible. The assessment proforma requires that the assessor gives consideration to whether the LDP site could cause an odour nuisance, in which case, the planning process would at the least require it to be conditioned before beneficial use.

2. Light nuisance

The sites under consideration for the LDP and the future use of the sites have to be considered for the potential for nuisance from artificial light. Lighting systems from security perimeter units to those used for recreation and leisure pitches have the potential to be intrusive to residential accommodation if not correctly positioned. There are currently no legislative controls in place for the Authority to use to require that lights are removed or the nuisance abated. In this regard, the consideration for the type of development proposed and its proximity to residential accommodation

must be taken into account. The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 will amend section 79 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to create the category of artificial light as a statutory nuisance; however that legislation has yet to be enacted in Wales. In the interim period and for the purposes of LDP site assessment, the potential for light nuisance must be noted and regard given to the possible end use of each site in relation to the proximity to existing residential developments.

3. Noise

Noise potential from development is a material planning consideration and guidance has been in use for a number of years to inform the planning process of the suitability of a proposed development. In terms of the assessment for the potential end use of the LDP sites, the assessor will need to consider the impact of noise using two main guidance tools: Planning Guidance (Wales), Technical Advice Note (Wales) 11, Noise (October 1997) and British Standard 4142 (1997).

TAN 11 is used to assess the suitability of residential development near transport related noise sources such as road, rail, and airports as well as noise from industrial and commercial operations. The TAN document provides four noise exposure categories that local authorities are required to have regard to in the determination of planning for residential development protection. For each of the categories the TAN document recommends limits for both day and night time exposure for new dwellings. If a development falls within noise exposure categories A or B, noise need not be considered or could be controlled by conditioning the planning permission. Noise exposure category C would not normally be considered suitable for residential development but it may in certain circumstances be granted. Where new dwellings are proposed in an area where the noise exposure that falls within category D, the planning permission would be refused.

British Standard 4142 is used to assess the likelihood of a noise complaint from an industrial source under normal operating conditions using a mixture of calculations and measurements. It can be used to assess noise levels from both existing and new or modified premises in the vicinity of existing housing and other noise sensitive uses.

4. Waste

The correct handling, storage and disposal of waste from a commercial or industrial process is controlled by a variety of legislative tools, depending on the nature of the originating premises and the nature of the waste. As a material planning condition, the control of waste from a relevant process would need to be considered and the appropriate scheme of waste control conditioned into the planning permission. Commercial waste from premises such as takeaways and restaurants could give rise to pest control and insect infestation problems and would be of major concern in relation to food hygiene. The planning controls under circumstances such as these would need to reflect the requirements of the Food Safety Act and its subordinate regulations. If the proposed land use were for a process that required an operating permit issued by either the Environment Agency or the local authority, the handling storage and disposal would be a condition of the permit, however, the planning process would need to reflect this through conditions relating to planning approval.

5. Contamination

Land contaminated from human activities can remain in a contaminated state for centuries. Process such as mineral extraction, metalworking, petroleum and oil refining leave their legacy in the form of heavy metals and chemical compounds in the soil. Some of the contaminated materials can be toxic to humans through ingestion, inhalation and through physical contact. Other forms of contamination such as the depositing of waste in landfills has created pockets of landfill gas that can be explosive if it builds up underneath buildings. The impact of contamination is not restricted to the soil but can contaminated watercourses and groundwater via underground fissures in base rock and gravels. The results can create contaminated drinking water and spring water, dangerous not only to humans but to livestock and other animals.

The total restoration of land to its original condition is rarely achievable, however, where a development is proposed on land suspected to be contaminated through its previous use, the planning process can ensure that the land be remediated to a suitable level. The standard of site remediation is assessed in accordance with the guidance issued by DEFRA known as the Contaminated Land Exposure Assessment model (CLEA). Where a development is proposed, the planning process will condition that the site be investigated in accordance with the CLEA model, remediated, monitored and the standard of site clean up verified by follow up testing prior to the development taking place. Many local authorities have historical mapping systems to inform of the locations of potentially contaminated sites within their areas which when combined with more recent land use history, a reasonably accurate assessment can be made of the likely contaminants present on site. The developer will be responsible for supplying the planning authority with sufficient information to discharge the planning conditions relating to contamination. In order to consider the potential end use of an LDP site, the assessor will need to refer to the information held on the current mapping system to assess whether the site in question is on or in close proximity to a potentially contaminated land site. Should this be the case, the future end use of the site would be subject to the conditions of a site investigation and remediation strategy as outlined above.

Summary

The assessor is required to give an overall comment on the suitability of the site and its proposed use along with a summary of further detailed assessments that are recommended.

Consideration for alternative uses

The assessor is required to give consideration for potentially alternative uses of the LDP site under consideration.

APPENDIX 3 – POSITION OF SITES SUITABLE FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
A16	Windsor Colliery The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	Residential/Leisure
B10	Coed y Pica The topography of the site means that it has a capacity of less than 10 dwellings and therefore falls below the threshold for inclusion as a housing site within the Deposit LDP. The site was granted consent in 2006 for 5 dwellings (P/05/1664). It was not therefore considered to be appropriate to allocate but has been left within settlement limits.	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	Residential
D88	Ysgol lfor Bach More detailed examinations have indicated significant access problems. In light of this it was deemed more appropriate to leave unallocated within settlement limits to allow it to come forward as a brownfield redevelopment should access issues be resolved within the plan period.	Senghenydd	Aber Valley	Residential
E188	Land east of Coedcae Road The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Abertridwr	Aber Valley	Residential
F8	Land West of Four Terraces The highways department have indicated that there are major constraints in accessing the site, as the width of the road is substandard. It is however noted that the site offers one of only a few opportunities for new housing development in the Aber Valley so it has	Senghenydd	Aber Valley	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	been considered appropriate not to allocate but to leave within settlement limits as an acceptable rounding off of the settlement of Senghenydd.			
A07	Bedwelly Road The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP along with D46.	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Residential
A25	Aberbargoed Plateau The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Mixed Use
D46	Land North of Bedwelly Road The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP along with A07.	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Residential
D47	Land at Aberbargoed Tip Part of the site is required for the Bedwelly Road Relief Road, although further discussions with Highways have indicated that it would not be possible for an access to be provided into the remainder of the site from the bypass and therefore it is not deemed appropriate for the site to be included with the Deposit LDP.	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Residential (Part)
D53	Bedwelly Comprehensive School The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The boundary has been amended to accommodate only the housing component and is therefore no longer considered as a mixed-use proposal. The leisure element is allocated as a formal leisure facility.	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Mixed Use

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E138	<p>Bargoed Ambulance Station</p> <p>The site was not suitable for residential development due to its proximity to the Country Park and therefore a tourism-based proposal was considered more acceptable. No specific proposals for such a use have been identified and therefore it is considered most appropriate to continue to leave the site outside of the settlement boundary. Proposals for future development will then be determined in accordance with appropriate LDP policies and national planning guidance.</p>	Bargoed	Aberbargoed	Commercial Leisure/Tourism
E142	<p>Aberbargoed and District Hospital</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Residential
E314	<p>Land at Coed y Brain House</p> <p>There are a number of sites deemed suitable for further consideration in the Aberbargoed area, although, in the interests of ensuring balanced development across the County Borough in a sustainable manner which reflects the role and function of individual settlements it is not considered appropriate to allocate all sites in the Aberbargoed area. In determining which sites were to go forward as allocations, consideration has been given to the how well sites conform with the strategy in addition to how realistic such allocations are.</p> <p>The site does not conform with three component parts of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is greenfield, therefore it is not exploiting brownfield opportunities • The site would represent a greenfield settlement extension and, taking into account the availability of brownfield sites in the area which better reflect the strategy, as well as sites with planning consent, it is not considered to be a balanced approach to future growth to allow additional sites to be released. • As a greenfield settlement extension, the site would not limit the impact on the 	Aberbargoed	Aberbargoed	Residential

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

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
D28	<p>Land south of Chapel Farm Terrace</p> <p>The site is constrained by its location within a Zone C Flood Risk area where highly vulnerable development such as housing should be precluded. The Council has adopted a precautionary approach to the designation of land within flood risk areas and as such it is considered inappropriate to allocate the site for an alternative use.</p> <p>It is intended to leave the site within settlement limits to allow it to come forward for an alternative use provided it can be demonstrated that flood risk can be acceptably managed.</p>	Cwmcarn	Abercarn	Mixed Use
A05	<p>Land adjacent to Abernant Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Markham	Argoed	Residential
E13	<p>Land immediately adjacent to Gelynos Avenue</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has the benefit of outline planning consent.</p>	Argoed	Argoed	Residential
E51	<p>Land at the rear of James St</p> <p>Whilst the site itself is acceptable in ecology terms, it would not be regarded as a natural extension to the settlement unless the boundary was rationalised. The site boundary would also need to be amended to ensure adequate access can be provided. However, it would not be possible to create a more rational boundary as the site adjoins a SINIC and the release of additional land would be detrimental to the important ecological value of the area.</p> <p>In addition, given the role and function of Markham where little change is envisaged, the</p>	Markham	Argoed	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	allocation of a second greenfield site in addition to the site at Abernant Road, which is currently allocated in the UDP, would not be considered to be a balanced approach to future growth.			
A08	<p>Parc Estate (Phase 2)</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The boundary of the site has been amended to incorporate B12.</p>	Glifach	Bargoed	Residential
B12	<p>Parc Estate(Phase 1)</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Glifach	Bargoed	Residential
D73	<p>YGG Cwm Rhymni</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. It has the benefit of planning consent for a 100% affordable housing development.</p>	Bargoed	Bargoed	Residential
A09	<p>The Grove</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site was granted full consent in 2006 for 13 dwellings.</p>	Trethomas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Residential
A10	<p>Tyn y Waun Farm</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site was granted outline consent in 2001 and full consent for 3 dwellings on part of the site was granted in 2006.</p>	Machen	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
D03	<p>Land adjacent to Upper Glyn Gwyn Street</p> <p>Part of the site will be required to facilitate the provision of an access road to the Bedwas Colliery site. Given the number of units proposed on the Colliery site itself, it is not considered necessary to promote the land in question for additional housing as previously identified in the candidate site register. The site has instead been identified as a new country park allocation with an indicative alignment of an access road also being identified.</p>	Trethomas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Residential
D04	<p>Bedwas Colliery</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Bedwas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Mixed Use
D74	<p>Garth View</p> <p>The width of the access limits the capacity of the site to 5 dwellings. The site should therefore not be allocated, but considered as a small site within settlement limits.</p>	Bedwas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Residential
E145	<p>Trethomas Health Centre</p> <p>Whilst the principle of development on the site is acceptable, the health centre is still operational and therefore it would be more appropriate to actively promote the other suitable brownfield site in the area, namely Bedwas Colliery as well as those sites that have the benefit of planning consent. The site will not be allocated but will be left within the settlement boundary.</p>	Trethomas	Bedwas, Trethomas and Machen	Residential
A17	<p>South of the proposed link road</p> <p>The site is constrained by approximately one third of the site being designated as a SINC and TPO woodland. In addition, the Chartist Bridge located above the site is intrusive</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
C24	<p>both visually and in terms of noise. It is a greenfield site and its development would have ecological and visual impacts. In light of this, it is deemed unacceptable to actively promote this as an allocation when less constrained brownfield sites are available in the strategy area. The site has therefore been removed from the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Whilst Blackwood is identified as a Principal town, it is not identified as an area to accommodate significant additional housing growth. During the previous plan period, the area has experienced major growth and therefore, in the interests of promoting a balanced approach to growth, development should be directed towards areas that need housing to help sustain communities. It is considered that the limited brownfield redevelopments proposed in the town are in accordance with the strategic desire to promote brownfield opportunities and reducing the impact on the countryside. Further growth in Blackwood over and above this will be primarily dependent upon the release of edge of settlement greenfield sites, which will have negative effects on other aims and objectives of the Plan.</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Residential
	<p>Land at Cwm Gelli</p> <p>Sites scores poorly in relation to the Strategy on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys (north) of the County Borough. • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities • The site would not be regarded as promoting the full and effective use of urban land as it is clearly an extension into the countryside • The site would be encroaching on prominent open countryside and therefore would not be considered as protecting or conserving the natural environment. • Whilst Blackwood is identified as a Principal town, it is not identified as an area to accommodate significant additional housing growth. During the previous plan period, the area has experienced major growth and therefore, in the interests of promoting a balanced approach to growth, development should be directed towards areas that need housing to help sustain communities. It is considered that the limited brownfield 			

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>redevelopments proposed in the town are in accordance with the strategic desire to promote brownfield opportunities and reducing the impact on the countryside. Further growth in Blackwood over and above this will be dependent upon the release of edge of settlement greenfield sites, which will have negative effects on other aims and objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>The site was considered as part of the UDP Inquiry. Paragraph 2.48.2 of the UDP Inspectors Report states <i>“it is my opinion that the allocation of this site for housing would be wholly inappropriate. Such development would amount to a significant spread of the urban settlement into a particularly conspicuous stretch of countryside alongside a main approach into Blackwood and this would cause appreciable harm to the character and appearance of these immediate surroundings. It would also be likely to damage the setting of the farmhouse and associated barns which are Grade II Listed Buildings and could adversely affect the grounds of the Maes Manor Hotel which are included in the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.”</i></p> <p>It is considered that this view is still valid within the current planning context.</p>			
D15	<p>Land at Berllangron Cottages</p> <p>Further consideration of this site indicates that the Chartist Bridge located above the site is intrusive both visually and in terms of noise. In addition, the bridge forms a defensible northern boundary to Blackwood and therefore the development of the site would be considered to be an erosion of the open countryside.</p> <p>Whilst Blackwood is identified as a Principal town, it is not identified as an area to accommodate significant additional housing growth. During the previous plan period, the area has experienced major growth and therefore, in the interests of promoting a balanced approach to growth, development should be directed towards areas that need housing to help sustain communities. It is considered that the limited brownfield</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>redevelopments proposed in the town are in accordance with the strategic desire to promote brownfield opportunities and reducing the impact on the countryside. Further growth in Blackwood over and above this will be dependent upon the release of edge of settlement greenfield sites, which will have negative effects on other aims and objectives of the Plan.</p>			
E25	<p>Land east of Bryn Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Cefn Fforest	Blackwood	Residential
E139	<p>Blackwood Ambulance Station</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site is combined with site E147.</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Residential
E147	<p>Tyr Sirhowy Mental Health Unit</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site is combined with site E139.</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Residential
E277	<p>Land at Cwm Gelli</p> <p>Discussed under site C24.</p>	Blackwood	Blackwood	Residential
B18	<p>Pencoed Avenue</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site is combined with site E121.</p>	Cefn Fforest	Cefn Fforest	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E121	<p>Land to the west of Pencoeed Avenue (southern site)</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The boundary of adjoining site B18 has been amended to incorporate this land.</p>	Cefn Fforest	Cefn Fforest	Residential
B16	<p>Land at Hillary Rise</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Pontywaun	Crosskeys	Residential
C11	<p>Pontywaun Farm</p> <p>The site was identified as most suitable for sport or leisure use, due to the ecological constraints, zone C flood risk designation and the location of a major trunk sewer through the site, which are significant constraints to built development. Given these constraints, it is not considered appropriate to include a site of this size within the settlement boundary, as it is not realistically anticipated to come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>Furthermore, given the difficulty of accessing the site by modes other than the car, it has not been taken forward as a leisure allocation, although can continue to be used for informal leisure.</p>	Pontywaun	Crosskeys	Sport/ Leisure
D14	<p>Land at Croespenmaen Industrial Estate</p> <p>The site is a duplicate of site E103 and is discussed under this reference.</p>	Croespenmaen	Crumlin	Residential/Leisure /Industrial
D17	<p>Land adjacent to Navigation Industrial Park</p> <p>Part of site is considered under reference E111. The remainder of the site is allocated as a SINC.</p>	Crumlin	Crumlin	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E31	<p>Land north of Pendinas Avenue</p> <p>The site was allocated as informal leisure within the UDP, although the site is gated and is therefore not used for this purpose. As the site is not being utilised for leisure purposes, it would be inappropriate to allocate the land within the context of the LDP. The Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (MIPPS) for housing indicates that in deciding which sites should be allocated for housing, consideration should be given to the capacity of existing infrastructure including social infrastructure such as schools. As part of the evidence base for the LDP, the education department have been consulted and it has been indicated that the local school cannot accommodate the pupils that could potentially be generated from the development of this site as there is insufficient expansion space for new classrooms to be accommodated. Given this, it is considered inappropriate to allocate the site for housing. However, the site will be left unallocated within the settlement boundary to allow the site to come forward should education issues be resolved in the future.</p>	Croespenmaen	Crumlin	Residential
E103	<p>Site of GB Engineering and adjacent Industrial Land</p> <p>The Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement (MIPPS) for housing indicates that in deciding which sites should be allocated for housing, consideration should be given to the capacity of existing infrastructure including social infrastructure such as schools. As part of the evidence base for the LDP, the education department have been consulted and it has been indicated that the local school cannot accommodate the pupils that could potentially be generated from the development of this site as there is insufficient expansion space for new classrooms to be accommodated. Given this, it is considered inappropriate to allocate the site for housing. However, the site will be left unallocated within the settlement boundary to allow the site to come forward should education issues be resolved in the future</p>	Croespenmaen	Crumlin	Residential or General Industrial

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E111	<p>Navigation Colliery</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Crumlin	Crumlin	Residential/Mixed Use
E149	<p>Land at lower Ton-y-Felin Farm</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as an employment allocation in the Deposit.</p>	Croespenmaen	Crumlin	Offices
E166	<p>Land east of Treowen Road</p> <p>Further consideration of the site has indicated that the site would not be suitable due to a lack of visibility and lack of safe pedestrian access.</p>	Treowen	Crumlin	Residential
D37	<p>Land off Railway Terrace</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Fochriw	Darren Valley	Residential
D42	<p>Land off Cefn Road</p> <p>A previous planning consent indicated that the site only has a capacity of 7 dwellings due to the topography of the land and therefore should not be allocated but should remain within settlement limits.</p>	Deri	Darren Valley	Residential
D43	<p>Land adjacent to New Road</p> <p>The majority of the site lies within Zone C of the flood plain and, in the interests of promoting a precautionary approach to the selection of sites with zone C and in response to comments made by the Environment Agency, it is not considered appropriate to take the site forward.</p>	Deri	Darren Valley	Residential/Mixed Use

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E62	<p>Area of land north of Fochriw, Gelligaer Common</p> <p>The site is part of a larger area identified on the constraints map as a secondary coal resource.</p>	Fochriw	Darren Valley	Safeguarding of Minerals
E384	<p>Cwmbargoed Disposal Point</p> <p>The site has been allocated for waste management facilities.</p>	Fochriw	Darren Valley	Waste Facilities
F6	<p>East of Fochriw</p> <p>There were two sites identified as suitable for further consideration for housing within the Candidate Sites Register in the settlement of Fochriw. Whilst the Strategy promotes development in the north of the County Borough, this growth should be realistic to the role and function of settlements. The Strategy noted that limited housing development would be acceptable in the village and therefore it is considered that the allocation of two significant sites in the village would go beyond what is considered to be a balanced approach to growth.</p> <p>Site F6 is more constrained in highways terms due to the need to widen the road to ensure access can be achieved. In addition, D37 has received developer interest and is a brownfield opportunity on a site previously used for residential purposes, although existing terraces on the site have now been cleared, whereas F6 is a greenfield site. It is therefore deemed that D37 is most in accordance with the strategy and has been allocated accordingly.</p>	Fochriw	Darren Valley	Residential
B24	<p>Valley View</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Hengoed	Hengoed	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
D61	Land off Penallta Road In light of an identified need for allotments within the Ystrad Mynach area, this former allotment site will be retained for allotment use.	Ystrad Mynach	Hengoed	Residential
E58	Cefn Hengoed Community Centre The site was incorrectly identified in the candidate site register and should relate to Cefn Hengoed Youth Centre, which was under the site size threshold. No further consideration was therefore given through this process, as it was a small site.	Cefn Hengoed	Hengoed	Residential/ Community Facilities
A14	Jeremy Oils The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Residential
D90	Land at the rear of Wingfield Crescent The site is constrained by its location within a C1/C2 Flood Risk area where highly vulnerable development would be unacceptable. As a result, it would be inappropriate to actively promote this site for residential development. However, the site has been left within settlement limits and, subject to the completion of a Flood Consequences Assessment, may be acceptable for development.	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Residential
E196	Land at Morgan Street, north of community centre. The site is considered most appropriate to retain its existing use so it will be left within settlement limits.	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Office/Light Industry
E211	Land at Wingfield Works	Llanbradach	Llanbradach	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>The site is constrained by its location within a zone C flood risk area where highly vulnerable development would be unacceptable. As a result, the LDP has sought to adopt the precautionary approach to preclude residential development in the flood plain where possible.</p> <p>However, the brownfield part of the site (the western extent) has been left within settlement limits and, subject to the completion of an acceptable Flood Consequences Assessment, may be acceptable for development. The remainder of the site has been excluded from the settlement boundary, as it is an important area of open space.</p>			
A23	<p>Land at Hawtin Park</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Gellihaf	Maesycwmmmer	Residential
D57	<p>Land at Holly House Nursing Home, Victoria Road</p> <p>The site scores poorly in relation to the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys area in the north of the County Borough • Development should be targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements - Fleur de Lys is not identified as an area for future residential growth as it has a range of housing types. In addition, the site is poorly related to the main centre of Fleur de Lys. • The allocation of this site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns – the site is located on the southern edge of Fleur de Lys and its development for housing would constitute ribbon development. • Reduce the impact of development on the countryside – only a small area of the site is acceptable as the site is constrained by TPOs and a SINIC. <p>In light of this it is considered that the site should not be taken forward as an allocation</p>	Fleur-de-Lys	Maesycwmmmer	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	as other sites within the strategy area score better. It should be noted that the constraints on the site limit the development to the footprint of the existing nursing home and consequently the developable area is likely to fall below the site size threshold necessary for development. The site has however been retained within the settlement boundary.			
D59	Land to the North of Bryn Meadows Golf Club Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.	Pontllanfraith	Maesycwmmr	Residential
D60	Land at Gellideg Lane Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.	Maesycwmmr	Maesycwmmr	Residential
D147	Land north of Duffryn Industrial Estate The site has been included as an employment allocation.	Ystrad Mynach	Maesycwmmr	Offices
E189	Land at Gellideg Heights The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Maesycwmmr	Maesycwmmr	Residential
E233	Land at Gwernau Ganol and Gwernau Fawr Farms The site scores poorly in relation to the Strategy as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a greenfield site and therefore would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not located in Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area in the north of the 	Maesycwmmr	Maesycwmmr	Residential/ Sport and Leisure

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>County Borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development would not be considered to be resource efficient as would be considered to be a significant extension into the open countryside. • The countryside impact of the proposed development would be significant as it is partially covered by a SINC. <p>The site has the capacity to accommodate over 1000 dwellings, although in line with the strategy it would be more appropriate to balanced growth across the County Borough rather than promoting a significant amount of development in one location.</p> <p>In light of the poor conformity with the strategy, the ecological value of the site and the availability of other sites in the Maesycwmmr area, which are in accordance with the strategy, it is not considered appropriate to take the site forward. The site has therefore been left outside of the settlement boundary.</p>			
E295	<p>Land at Gellideg Heights</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.</p>	Maesycwmmr	Maesycwmmr	Residential
E349	<p>Land south of Gellideg Heights</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to this site along with other sites in the Gellideg Heights area to determine what boundaries should be used. The most appropriate boundary has been defined under E189.</p>	Maesycwmmr	Maesycwmmr	Residential
E381	<p>Land off A469</p> <p>This site has been discussed under D147</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Maesycwmmr	General Industry/Offices

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
B11	Gas Works Site, Mill Road The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	Residential
D09	Land at Pontypany Industrial Estate The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	Residential
D75	St Ilans Comprehensive The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	Residential/ Community Facilities
E204	Land adjacent to existing Asda store, Pontygwindy Road The site was considered most suitable for employment use in the Candidate Sites Register, as retail would be contrary to national retail planning policy. Further consideration has determined that it would not be considered appropriate for an employment site to be served off the same access as a supermarket. Furthermore, the Atkins Study on employment land identified that there were sufficient employment land allocated in the County Borough and, given that the site is divorced for any other allocated or protected industrial estates, it is not considered appropriate to take the site forward for further consideration. However, as the site is located within the settlement, the site should remain within the settlement boundary, but not actively be promoted as an allocation.	Caerphilly	Morgan Jones	Employment (B1)
A02	Old Barrell Store	Rhymney	Moriah	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.			
A03	Lower Hill Street The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Rhymney	Moriah	Residential
B01	Greensway The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Abertysswg	Moriah	Residential
B17	Maerdy Crossing The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Rhymney	Moriah	Residential
D34	Land opposite Carn-y-tyla Terrace Site is a duplicate and has been considered under reference E265.	Abertysswg	Moriah	Residential
D35	Land adjacent to Alexander Street and Glyn Street The Strategy states that limited housing development will be encouraged in residential villages in the Heads of the Valleys area, including Abertysswg. Site E265 has recently been granted outline planning consent, which will provide approximately 133 new units to help diversify the housing stock. In addition, in order to regenerate the eastern part of the village, it is considered appropriate to include a relatively small site (B01 Greensway) as the principle of residential development has been established on the site by the virtue of a previously planning consent, which has now lapsed. In addition, the site would constitute a natural rounding off of the settlement. The other sites proposed in Abertysswg would constitute significant extensions to the	Abertysswg	Moriah	Residential

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

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E265	<p>Land fronting Waun Terrace</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Abertysswg	Moriah	Residential
E379	<p>Land to the rear of Benjamin Court</p> <p>In assessing the site against the Strategy, the site scores poorly in relation to three component parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site is not considered to be promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends into the open countryside. • The allocation of this site is not considered to reduce the impact of development on the countryside as it is considered that the site is visually prominent. It is noted in the Strategy that, where settlements are identified for growth, regard should be had for the need to protect and/or conserve those aspects of the natural environment that are valued for their landscape, biodiversity or agricultural interest. This site would be more intrusive on the landscape than other sites that are better related to the town. <p>In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, a search sequence should be followed, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>Within Rhymney, there are a number of brownfield sites (B17, 1163, A02) that, by virtue of planning consent, and/or their proximity to the train station and shops, would be regarded as more acceptable than greenfield settlement extensions. The site has therefore not been taken forward for further consideration.</p>	Rhymney	Moriah	Residential
A06	Land to the east of Handball Court	Nelson	Nelson	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>			
C02	<p>Land east of Hen Berthlwyd</p> <p>The site scored poorly in relation to the Strategy due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area. • The site will not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site is an encroachment into the open countryside. • It would not limit countryside impact as the site has been identified as important in biodiversity terms. <p>It is recognised that Nelson is a key settlement and therefore development which reflects the role and function should be promoted. However, there are other sites in the village that are deemed more appropriate for development, namely the two sites with the benefit of a valid planning consent or where a planning application has been submitted (the Cattle Market site and the Handball Court site). It is therefore considered that, in the interests of balancing development across the whole of the County Borough, it would be inappropriate to identify additional greenfield sites over and above these allocations. The site has therefore not been taken forward for further consideration.</p>	Nelson	Nelson	Residential
D50	<p>Ty Du</p> <p>The site has been discussed under reference E382.</p>	Nelson	Nelson	General Industrial/Offices
E321	<p>Discussed under C02.</p>	Nelson	Nelson	Residential
E376	<p>Land adjoining Pentwyn Road and Bwl Road</p>	Nelson	Nelson	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>The site scored poorly in relation to the Strategy due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area. • The site will not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site is an encroachment into the open countryside. • It would not limit countryside impact as the site has been identified as important in biodiversity terms. <p>It is recognised that Nelson is a key settlement and therefore development which reflects the role and function should be promoted. However, there are other sites in the village that are deemed more appropriate for development, namely the two sites with the benefit of a valid planning consent or where a planning application has been submitted (the Cattle Market site and the Handball Court site). It is therefore considered that, in the interests of balancing development across the whole of the County Borough, it would be inappropriate to identify additional greenfield sites over and above these allocations. In addition, it is considered that Bwl Road and Pentwyn Road form a natural boundary. The site has therefore not been taken forward for further consideration.</p>			
E382	<p>Ty Du</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as an employment allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Nelson	Nelson	Offices
D39	<p>Land at Graig Rhymney</p> <p>Part of the site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	New Tredegar	New Tredegar	Residential
D40	<p>Old School Site, Elliott Town</p>	New Tredegar	New Tredegar	Leisure/Community Facilities

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>Part of the site has been developed as a car park to serve the community facilities. Only part of the site is therefore available for an alternative use and is constrained by the location of the site within a C2 Flood Risk area.</p> <p>It is therefore more appropriate for the site to be located within the settlement boundary rather than allocate for a specific land use.</p>			
D141	<p>Land fronting South View Terrace</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	New Tredegar	New Tredegar	Residential
A21	<p>Land at Fields Park</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Newbridge	Newbridge	Residential
A24	<p>Land at Ty Pwll</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Pantside	Newbridge	Residential
D18	<p>Land north of Ellesmere Court</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP. The site has the benefit of outline planning consent and a full planning application is currently awaiting determination.</p>	Pantside	Newbridge	Residential
E50	<p>Land at Fields Park Road</p> <p>The site is considered under site reference A21.</p>	Newbridge	Newbridge	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E293	Land at Old Pant Road The site has been considered under reference D18.	Pantside	Newbridge	Residential
E386	Land at North Celynen The site is considered as most appropriate for its existing use (employment) in light of the recommendations of the Atkins Employment Study, which identified the site as being important in meeting forecast employment needs. The continued protection of the site for employment use is therefore an important part of maintaining a portfolio of employment sites across the County Borough. The site has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.	Newbridge	Newbridge	General Industry/Offices
A28	Land to the Rear of Oak Terrace Further consideration of the site since the opening of the Oak Terrace bypass indicates that the road is at a much lower level with a steep drop from the site to the road. The shape of the site, the steepness and the fact that it is crossed by a number of drainage channels means that would be difficult to develop in a comprehensive manner. It is therefore not considered appropriate to actively promote this site for residential development.	Pengam	Pengam	Residential
B22	Oak Terrace The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Fleur-de-Lys	Pengam	Residential
D63	Plas Road Due to significant access constraints into the site, it is considered that the site should not be allocated but should remain within the settlement boundary, particularly given that the Oak Terrace site (B22) in close proximity is less constrained and will offer the opportunity	Fleur-de-Lys	Pengam	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	for new housing development in this area.			
C16	Allotment Garden, Llwyn on Lane The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Oakdale	Penmaen	Residential
D11	Plateau 4 The site is considered as most appropriate for its existing use (employment) in light of the recommendations of the Atkins Employment Study, which identified the site as being important in meeting forecast employment needs. The site therefore continues to be promoted for employment use in the Deposit LDP.	Oakdale	Penmaen	General Industrial/Offices
D64	Ty Nant The site is only 0.39 Ha and the site assessment has identified that the mature trees should be retained. Taking this into account, and the need to relocate the onsite parking provision, the site will fall below the 0.33 Ha threshold and therefore will not be considered for allocation. The site has been left within the settlement boundary to allow it to come forward for a smaller development subject to other material considerations being met in the future.	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Residential
E287	Consortium of land adjacent to Trencenydd Industrial Estate It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Industrial/Offices
E291	Former railway land, adjoining Trencenydd Industrial Estate	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	General Industrial/Offices

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.			
E292	Land at Treceynydd Industrial Estate It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	General Industrial/Offices
F9	Energlyn Sidings Further assessment has indicated that this site would be the most appropriate location for the new Energlyn station, which has been identified in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	Penyrheol	Residential/ Mixed Use
D20	Land adjacent to Islwyn Park Site is most suitable for its existing employment use and has been protected accordingly in the Deposite LDP.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	Industrial/ Mixed use
E54	Glanbrynar Farm (South) Tipping on the site as part of the Sirhowy Enterprise Way (SEW) development has meant that the site is now more visually prominent. It is considered that the SEW forms a defensible boundary and development to the north of the road, particularly at this higher level should be resisted. The site has therefore been left outside of the settlement boundary.	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	General Industrial/Offices
E90	FKI Hawker Works, Newport Rd, Blackwood (Eastern Site) The site is considered most appropriate for its existing use and has been protected for	Blackwood	Pontllanfraith	General Industrial/Offices/ non-housing mixed

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E296	<p>employment in the Deposit LDP.</p> <p>Land at Newbridge Road Industrial Estate</p> <p>The site is considered most appropriate for its existing use and has been protected for employment in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Pontllanfraith	Pontllanfraith	<p>use</p> <p>General Industry/Offices</p>
A26	<p>Land adjacent to Brynglas</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Pontlloftyn	Pontlloftyn	Residential
D33	<p>Land adjacent to Brynhyfyd</p> <p>This site scores less well than other sites in Pontlloftyn as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site would be regarded as encroachment into the open countryside • It would not limit countryside impact, as development would result in the loss of some trees and hedgerows and would clearly result in the development of the open countryside. <p>In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, a search sequence should be followed, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>Pontlloftyn is identified as an area where limited residential development will be acceptable, particularly as it has good access to the rail network. There are two brownfield sites (1162 and E393) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock.</p>	Pontlloftyn	Pontlloftyn	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>Furthermore, another large site (A26) has the benefit of planning consent and is better related to Pontlottyn shops and station. It is considered that these three sites offer an appropriate range for the village and that there is no need for additional sites over and above this.</p>			
E75	<p>Land at Capital Valley</p> <p>Site is considered most suitable for its existing use and has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Industrial
E76	<p>Land at Brynhyfryd</p> <p>This site scores less well than other sites in Pontlottyn as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • The site would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns where development is concentrated within settlements as it is considered that this site would be regarded as encroachment into the open countryside • It would not limit countryside impact, as development would result in the loss of some trees and hedgerows and would clearly result in the development of the open countryside. <p>In accordance with the Housing MIPPS, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing in development plans, a search sequence should be followed, starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within settlements.</p> <p>Pontlottyn is identified as an area where limited residential development will be acceptable, particularly as it has good access to the rail network. There are two brownfield sites (1 162 and E393) that offer the opportunity to diversify the housing stock. Furthermore, another large site (A26) has the benefit of planning consent and is better</p>	Pontlottyn	Pontlottyn	Residential

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

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E260	<p>In order for the development of the site to be viable due to the significant highways improvements required to ensure an acceptable access can be achieved the site would have to be linked to E260, also incorporating an area of land which was not submitted through the candidate site process which lies between the E95 and E260. However, further consideration has indicated that this would not be acceptable due to the ecological value of the land between the sites. In light of these significant constraints, it is considered more appropriate to allocate other less constrained sites in Pontlloftyn.</p> <p>Land adjacent to South End Terrace</p> <p>In order for the development of the site to be viable due to the significant highways improvements required to ensure an acceptable access can be achieved the site would have to be linked to E95, also incorporating an area of land which was not submitted through the candidate site process which lies between the E95 and E260. However, further consideration has indicated that this would not be acceptable due to the ecological value of the land between the sites. In light of these significant constraints, it is considered more appropriate to allocate other less constrained sites in Pontlloftyn</p>	Pontlloftyn	Pontlloftyn	Residential
A13	<p>Eppynt Close</p> <p>The site also scores poorly in relation to the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site does not promote development opportunities in the Heads of the Valleys (north) part of the County Borough. • It does not exploit brownfield opportunities • It is not considered to reduce the impact on the countryside due to its SINC status • It is not considered to promote resource efficient settlement patterns due to its prominent hillside edge of settlement location. <p>The recent SINC review has identified that the site is still worthy of its identification as a</p>	Risca	Risca East	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p>SINC and was highlighted in particular as having the highest recorded number of marbled white butterfly in the local area.</p> <p>It is noted that Risca is identified as a principal town in the Strategy and, as such, development should be targeted to reflect its role and function. However, there are several brownfield sites proposed in Risca, all of which are in more sustainable locations in better proximity to the town centre and railway station. It is therefore considered that there is no need for additional greenfield land to be released.</p>			
D67	<p>The foundry site and land to the north</p> <p>After further consideration, the site has been allocated for new commercial use in the Deposit LDP. A planning application for a new supermarket on the site is currently awaiting determination.</p>	Pontymister	Risca West	Mixed Use
D68	<p>Backland area to the rear of Commercial Street</p> <p>The plan employs a precautionary approach to flood risk, seeking to ensure development avoids the flood plain where possible. Unlike other sites in Risca-Pontymister town centre this site does not have the benefit of planning consent, so, in the interests of flood risk, it is considered that it should not be allocated for a specific use.</p> <p>Given that the site lies within the settlement it is considered most appropriate for the site to remain in the settlement boundary to allow it to come forward for an appropriate use, subject to the an acceptable flood consequences assessment being undertaken.</p>	Pontymister	Risca West	Retail/Office/ Commercial Leisure
D69	<p>Brooklands Road, Council Service Site</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Pontymister	Risca West	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
D70	<p>Land adjacent to Lidl</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a retail allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Risca	Risca West	Retail/Office/ Commercial Leisure
E355	<p>Land to the west of Fernlea</p> <p>The site scores less well than other sites in the Risca area when assessed against the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located within the north of the County Borough (Heads of the Valleys area). • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns due its extension into the existing boundaries of the settlement into the countryside • It is not considered to limit the impact on the countryside <p>Furthermore, the site is constrained by the need to acquire land in order to gain access. There are brownfield sites within this Principal Town that score better in relation to the Strategy and therefore these have been allocated in preference to this site.</p>	Risca	Risca West	Residential
E360	<p>Land at Danygraig Works</p> <p>The Danygraig area of Risca is located on the opposite site of the bypass to the main centre and therefore is not as well related to the town centre and public transport nodes. Furthermore, the proximity to the bypass may impact on residential amenity due to noise. In light of this, it is considered appropriate to leave within the settlement boundary unallocated to allow the site to come forward in the future if noise issues can be satisfied.</p>	Risca	Risca West	Residential
A27	<p>Tir y Berth</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit along with</p>	Hengoed	St Cattwg	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
B05.				
B05	<p>Tir y Berth</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit along with A27.</p>	Hengoed	St Cattwg	Residential
C25	<p>Land at Gwaun Ar Lwyddes Farm</p> <p>The site scores poorly when assessed against the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the north of the County Borough. • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not considered to offer a balanced approach to future growth as it is not identified as an area that is in need of a choice of housing types as there is already a considerable range of dwelling types in the village. New houses should therefore be directed to other areas. • It is not considered that it would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends beyond the clear boundary of the settlement. • Penpedairheol is not identified as a settlement requiring additional housing to support its role and function. • It is not considered that the site would reduce the impact the development upon the countryside as the development would be regarded as an extension into the countryside. <p>This area was considered by the Inspector at the UDP Inquiry, who concluded “the land which lies outside this boundary is, due to its open nature, wholly different in character and appearance and the objection site can properly be regarded as part of Penpedairheol’s rural surroundings; this, notwithstanding the presence just to the north and north-east of this site of the Rhos-yr-arfa Farm complex and a large animal feeds</p>	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p><i>premises.</i></p> <p><i>The prospect of development here strengthens my opinion regarding this case. Housing on this site would represent a noticeable expansion of the urban area into this pleasant countryside fringe and cause serious harm to the character and appearance of these surroundings."</i></p> <p>It is considered that this is position is still valid in the current planning context.</p>			
D138	<p>Former playground at Cardiff Road</p> <p>Further consideration has identified that the location of a major culvert under this relatively small site would preclude built development on the site.</p>	Glan-y-nant	St Cattwg	Offices
E24	<p>Land adjacent to Bryncoed Terrace</p> <p>The site scores poorly when assessed against the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the north of the County Borough. • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not considered to offer a balanced approach to future growth as it is not identified as an area that is in need of a choice of housing types as there is already a considerable range of dwelling types in the village. New houses should therefore be directed to other areas. • It is not considered that it would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends beyond the clear boundary of the settlement. • Penpedairheol is not identified as a settlement requiring additional housing to support its role and function. • It is not considered that the site would reduce the impact the development upon the countryside as the development would be regarded as an extension into the 	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E60	<p>countryside. The site is also constrained by TPOs.</p> <p>Land off Trosnant Crescent</p> <p>The site scores poorly when assessed against the Strategy as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the north of the County Borough. • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities. • It is not considered to offer a balanced approach to future growth as it is not identified as an area that is in need of a choice of housing types as there is already a considerable range of dwelling types in the village. New houses should therefore be directed to other areas. • It is not considered that it would promote resource efficient settlement patterns as it extends beyond the clear boundary of the settlement. • Penybryn is not identified as a settlement requiring additional housing to support its role and function. • It is not considered that the site would reduce the impact the development upon the countryside as the development would be regarded as an extension into the countryside <p>Whilst the site does adjoin the existing settlement of Penybryn, the irregular shape of the site would mean that one its own it would appear an illogical extension and the only additional land that could be incorporated would be a playing field, which is not considered acceptable. On these grounds, it has not been considered appropriate to take the site forward.</p>	Penybryn	St Cattwg	Residential
E79	<p>Land adjacent to Tai'r Heol and Hospital Road</p> <p>Discussed under C25.</p>	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E82	Land at Gelligaer Court Discussed under C25.	Penpedairheol	St Cattwg	Residential
E132	Land off Trosnant Crescent Discussed under E60	Penybryn	St Cattwg	Residential
E226	Land adjacent to Carn Gethin Estate Given the ecological value of the site as an important area acting as a wildlife corridor between SINC's, built development was not considered acceptable in this location. However, it was considered that a smaller part may be deemed acceptable for sports or leisure use to allow the site to retain its function as a wildlife corridor. Further consideration has indicated that there is no intention to allocate the site for sports purposes, but it has been designated as a green wedge to prevent coalescence between Penpedairheol and Cefn Hengoed.	Cefn Hengoed	St Cattwg	Sport/Leisure
E245	Fields at Tir y Berth Farm Part of the site was identified as suitable for residential use. However, when assessed against the Preferred Strategy the site scored poorly as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located in the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration area in the North of the County Borough • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities • It would not limit the impact on the countryside as it is an extension into the countryside • The coalescence of the settlements of Cefn Hengoed and Penpedairheol is not deemed to reflect the role and functions of these settlements as separate communities. 	Cefn Hengoed	St Cattwg	Residential

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
D01	Cray Paint Works The site is discussed under reference E106.	Waterloo	St James	Mixed Use
D121	Land at Porset Row Site is segregated by the national cycle route and it is therefore considered most appropriate for the existing designation of informal recreation to be retained. Furthermore, the site has been designated as part of a green wedge to prevent coalescence between east Caerphilly and Porset.	Caerphilly	St James	Residential/Leisure
E106	Waterloo Works The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Waterloo	St James	Mixed Use
A20	Land between Van Road/Maes Glas, and the Railway The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential
B19	North View Terrace The 2007 Joint Housing Land Availability Study indicated that all units were under construction as of the base date of the study and therefore it is anticipated that all units would be completed before the Deposit Plan is published. The site has therefore not been taken forward as an allocation.	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential
C21	Land at Caerphilly Golfcourse When assessed against the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy, the site scored poorly on the basis that:	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential/ Mixed Use

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located within the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the whole site is classified as greenfield (The Planning Policy Wales definition of previously developed land excludes parks, recreation grounds and allotments even though they may contain certain urban features such as paths, pavilions or other features. Golf courses, by their nature, would also be excluded from this definition). • It would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns as built development would be considered as encroachment into the countryside. • The development would not reduce the impact on the countryside as part of the site is Common Land and the western site has been identified as worthy of retention. <p>Whilst it is noted that Caerphilly is a principal town and therefore further development should be promoted in order to reflect the role and function of this settlement, it is important that growth is balanced. Of those sites allocated for housing within the LDP, a high proportion are located within Caerphilly town, although it should be noted that the majority of these sites already have planning consent. Where new sites have been promoted within Caerphilly, sites that conform with a greater number of component parts of the Strategy have been taken forward in preference to this edge of settlement Greenfield extension. There is therefore no further need for additional greenfield land to be released in order to meet housing requirements in the Caerphilly Basin.</p> <p>The Inspector at the UDP Inquiry stated “this is an extensive area of open land which, to my mind, forms an integral part of the attractive, essentially rural surroundings on the southern side of the town. It is on the lower reaches of Caerphilly Mountain which creates a most impressive backdrop to this settlement and is, I have found, visible from numerous vantage points over a considerable distance. Development here would amount to a significant encroachment of the urban area into this sensitive and prominent stretch of countryside; this would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of these surroundings and seriously damage the setting of this historic</p>			

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	<p><i>town.</i></p> <p>It is considered that this position remains valid within the current planning context.</p>			
D05	<p>Land at Ness Tar</p> <p>Due to highways constraints associated with the development of the Ness Tar site is considered that development can only come forward if it is linked to the provision of a bypass for South East Caerphilly. The provision of the bypass would result in the release of a substantial area of greenfield land, some of which has been designated a SINIC and a Special Landscape Area. There are therefore significant ecological arguments against the provision of such the road.</p> <p>Whilst the provision of the road has potential benefits of alleviating traffic congestion in Caerphilly town centre and linked air quality issues, there is insufficient evidence at the present time to justify the bypass on these grounds and therefore comprehensive investigation of the sources of the problem, and assessment of the alternative options will need to be undertaken. However it is important to ensure that whilst the necessary investigative work is underway, no development is permitted that could potentially prejudice the future alignment of a bypass. On completion of the work the Council will either seek to confirm the safeguarded route for the development of a bypass or will remove the safeguarded corridor from the Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the allocation of the brownfield element of Ness Tar alone is unlikely to be viable, as access to the site without a bypass would be limited to significantly fewer dwellings than the site has capacity for. Furthermore, the allocation of the site may potentially impact on future development proposals including the bypass should a need be identified in the future. It is therefore considered most appropriate not to proactively allocate the Ness Tar site but to leave it within settlement limits to allow it to come forward should it become viable to do so in the future.</p>	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential/ Mixed Use

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
D06	Land adjacent to Watford Road, Watford Park The site has been taken forward as part of a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP, along with E144.	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential
E144	Caerphilly Miners Hospital The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP, along with D06	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential/ Mixed Use
E254	Ness Tar Plant Discussed under D05	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential/ Mixed Use
E269	Land south of Westhaven, Watford Road When assessed against the eight component parts of the Preferred Strategy, the site scored poorly on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not located within the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area • It would not exploit brownfield opportunities as the whole site is classified as greenfield • It would not promote resource efficient settlement patterns as development as would be considered as encroachment into the open countryside. • The development would not reduce the impact on the countryside as the site is identified as important for biodiversity and would result in the loss of heavy woodland. <p>Whilst it is noted that Caerphilly is a principal town and therefore further development should be promoted in order to reflect the role and function of this settlement, it is important that growth is balanced. Of those sites allocated for housing within the LDP, a</p>	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential/ Leisure

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

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E290	Land at Garran House, Nantgarw Road It is considered that the site is most suitable for its existing use as it was identified in the Atkins employment study as being most suitable to meet forecast employment needs. It has therefore been protected for employment use in the Deposit LDP.	Caerphilly	St Martins	Mixed Use (non-housing)/General Industrial/Offices
E299	Caerphilly Golf Club Discussed under C21.	Caerphilly	St Martins	Residential/ Mixed Use
A01	Land East of Llechryd Bungalow The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Llechryd	Twyn Carno	Residential
A29	Land to the South of Merthyr Road The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Princetown	Twyn Carno	Residential
D83	Twyn Carno Further consultation has indicated that a culvert runs directly under the site and it is therefore considered that this will significantly limit the developable area. The site is therefore not suitable for further consideration.	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Residential
D152	Former Skinner's garage and adjoining land The site was deemed most suitable employment use at the preferred strategy stage due to the good road links to the Heads of the Valleys and other employment areas. However, it is not deemed necessary to proactively allocate the site for employment use on the grounds that the Atkins Study found that there was sufficient employment land	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Employment based mixed use

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E326	<p>within the County Borough, with land available for employment development in Rhymney already. The site has however been left within the settlement boundary to allow for redevelopment in the future.</p> <p>Land at Carno Old Houses</p> <p>As a result of further consideration, it is not considered that a suitable access to this site could be delivered even as part of a more comprehensive development alongside E328 and E329. Furthermore part of the site lies without zone C of the flood plain where highly vulnerable development such as housing would not be acceptable.</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Residential
E328	<p>Land east of Cemetery House</p> <p>As a result of further consideration, it is not considered that a suitable access to this site could be delivered even as part of a more comprehensive development alongside E326 and E329. Furthermore part of the site lies without zone C of the flood plain where highly vulnerable development such as housing would not be acceptable.</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Residential
E329	<p>Land south of Carno Old Houses</p> <p>As a result of further consideration, it is not considered that a suitable access to this site could be delivered even as part of a more comprehensive development alongside E326 and E328. Furthermore part of the site lies without zone C of the flood plain where highly vulnerable development such as housing would not be acceptable.</p>	Rhymney	Twyn Carno	Residential
D112	<p>Land opposite Ynysddu Hotel</p> <p>The site lies within a C2 Flood Risk zone and therefore highly vulnerable development such as housing should be precluded. As a result of this, the most appropriate use of the site was deemed to be sport and leisure. However, as part of the SINC review the site</p>	Ynysddu	Ynysddu	Sports/Leisure

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
	was identified as worthy of inclusion as part of the River Sirhowy SINC due to its ecological value. It was not therefore deemed appropriate to take forward the site as a leisure allocation.			
E387	Land at Pen-Y-Cwarel Road The site is considered under reference F2	Wyllie	Ynysddu	Residential
F2	Land adjacent to Pen-y-Cwarel Road The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Wyllie	Ynysddu	Residential
B07	Penallta Yard The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Residential
D145	Caerphilly Road Industrial Estate The site has been protected as a secondary employment site in the Deposit LDP where B1, B2, B8 and Sui Generis uses would be permitted.	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Offices/Mixed Use
D146	Land north of the Royal Oak Due to the location of the site within a zone C flood risk area it was considered inappropriate to allocate the site for development. It has however been left within settlement limits and could come forward for redevelopment subject to the submission of an acceptable flood consequences assessment as well as other material considerations being met.	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Offices

Candidate Site Reference	Site Name and Details	Settlement	Ward	Preferred Use as identified in Candidate Sites Register
E148	<p>Ystrad Mynach Hospital</p> <p>As part of the proposal to construct a new hospital on the site opposite the existing hospital, it is proposed to relocate the playing pitches lost as part of this development onto the site of the existing hospital, which is due to close as part of the redevelopment. The site is therefore identified for formal pitch provision in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Sports/Leisure
E240	<p>Ystrad Fawr site off Caerphilly Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a new hospital allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Office/Community Facility/ Leisure
E367	<p>Land at New Road</p> <p>The site has been taken forward as a housing allocation in the Deposit LDP.</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Residential
E375	<p>Units 1-4 Caerphilly Road</p> <p>Discussed under D145</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Office/Mixed Use
E388	<p>Land to the rear of the Royal Oak Public House</p> <p>Discussed under D146</p>	Ystrad Mynach	Ystrad Mynach	Offices