

# LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOCUS GROUP THIRD MEETING

Friday 28<sup>th</sup> July 2006, 10:00am  
Committee Room 2, Dyffryn House, Ystrad Mynach

### Meeting Minutes

#### Present

Cllr Keith Griffiths	Cabinet Member for Transportation and Planning
Cllr David Hardacre	Cabinet Member for Education and Leisure
Cllr Lindsay Whittle	Leader of the Opposition
Cllr Geoffrey Hibert	Member of the Majority Opposition
Cllr Janet Jones	Representative of the Sustainable Development Panel
Rhian Kyte	Team Leader for Strategic and Development Planning
Pat Mears	Chief Planning Officer
Mark Rees-Williams	Chief Engineer
Chris Francis	for the Chief Housing Officer
Phil Davy	Head of Economic Development, Tourism and European Affairs
Bleddyn Hopkins	Head of Planning and Strategy, Education & Leisure
Peter Gomer	Head of Lifelong Learning and Leisure
Albert Heaney	Assistant Director, Resourcing and Performance, Social Services
John Rogers	Principal Solicitor for Planning, Land and Highways
Paul Cooke	Sustainable Development Co-ordinator
Sian Lewis	Living Environment Co-ordinator
Jane Roberts-Waite	Regeneration Co-ordinator

#### 1 Welcome

Cllr. Griffiths welcomed all to the third meeting of the LDP Focus Group and highlighted the importance of the group's task to debate and guide the alternative strategy options for the Caerphilly LDP.

#### 2 Apologies were received from:

Cllr Harry Andrews	Leader
Cllr Tudor Davies	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
Cllr Paul Ford	Cabinet Member for Living Environment and Housing
Cllr Stan Jenkins	Chair of Planning Committee
Cllr Les Rees	Vice Chair of Planning Committee
Cllr Graham Simmonds	Member representing both Independent Groups



REGENERATION

THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT

EDUCATION FOR LIFE

HEALTH SOCIAL CARE & WELL BEING



# LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Stuart Bates  
Tim Peppin  
Steve Delahaye  
Mark Williams

Chief Property Officer  
Head of Policy & Central Services  
Head of Public Protection  
Head of Public Services

## PROCEDURAL SESSION

- 3 The Chairman welcomed Jane Roberts-Waite as the new Regeneration Co-ordinator to the Group.
- 4 The minutes of the second meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> April 2006 were agreed.
- 5 In regard to the criteria to be utilised to assess candidate sites for development, Biodiversity and Landscape Assessment Proforma and Explanatory Notes were agreed.
- 6 In regard to the criteria to be utilised to assess candidate sites for development, the Environmental Health Assessment Proforma and Explanatory Notes were agreed.
- 7 The minutes of the Sustainability Group meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2006 were received.

## WORKSHOP SESSION

- 8 **Introduction:** In considering how the Local Development Plan (LDP) for Caerphilly County Borough should guide and manage future development, it is important that an appropriate land use strategy is adopted to guide future development in the County Borough over the next fifteen years. The preparation process requires consideration of alternative suitable strategies for the LDP.
- 9 The briefing paper called the “Development of Alternative Strategic Options” which had been previously sent to the group formed the basis of the workshop session. Roger Tanner and Rhian Kyte began the session by jointly delivering a presentation describing the basis for the alternative Strategy Options.
- 10 The briefing paper contained three strategy options whose constituent characteristics were assessed in terms of strengths and weaknesses by the Focus Group having split into three separate panels. Finally, after each panel had assessed each of the strategy options, they were asked to pick the six strongest and the six weakest out of all three. The aim was to identify the strongest characteristics on which a new strategy could be built while avoiding the weak aspects.
- 11 The assessments from the workshop session are attached as Appendix A.



REGENERATION

THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT

EDUCATION FOR LIFE

HEALTH SOCIAL CARE & WELL BEING



**CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options**

**OPTION A: CONTINUATION OF UDP DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY All Groups**

<b>a) Consolidate development in the south of the county borough within existing settlements</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Relates development to infrastructure</i></li> <li>• <i>Important to consolidate development as before</i></li> <li>• <i>Protects the environment; prevents overdevelopment &amp; gridlock</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Detrimental to other strategy areas</i></li> <li>• <i>Limiting free choice</i></li> <li>• <i>No real weakness as development is still allowed in appropriate amounts</i></li> </ul>
<b>b) Allow for the redevelopment of large brownfield sites in the south for mixed use development</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Avoids greenfield use</i></li> <li>• <i>Allows some development without using greenfield land</i></li> <li>• <i>Remediate and use where appropriate for development land to ease pressure further north</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Could skew development geographically</i></li> <li>• <i>Potential loss of industrial estates to housing use</i></li> <li>• <i>If used chiefly for housing development it would increase the journey to work for residents</i></li> </ul>
<b>c) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A development surcharge pays for improvements in the wider area</i></li> <li>• <i>An additional gain from development</i></li> <li>• <i>Delivers needed infrastructure</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Might overcharge and damage prospects</i></li> <li>• <i>Drives up house prices</i></li> <li>• <i>Small additional cost to purchaser</i></li> </ul>

<b>d) Continue to promote growth in the Mid Valleys Corridor</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No strength recognised</i></li> <li>• <i>Counter balance the growth on the M4 Corridor, both housing &amp; employment uses</i></li> <li>• <i>Maintains communities</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Loss of greenfield land</i></li> <li>• <i>Infrastructure is lagging behind development and could get worse</i></li> <li>• <i>Congestion, pressures on greenfield land may disrupt community cohesiveness &amp; hinder growth strategy for the north</i></li> </ul>
<b>e) Release of greenfield sites in the Mid Valleys Corridor to allow for additional growth</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No strength recognised</i></li> <li>• <i>COMMENT - May be needed to maintain growth</i></li> <li>• <i>No strength recognised</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Loss of greenfield land a severe weakness</i></li> <li>• <i>Greenfield loss and coalescence of communities</i></li> <li>• <i>Environmental damage, loss of landscape &amp; ecology</i></li> </ul>
<b>f) Allow for development opportunities in the North and in the Aber Valley</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No strength recognised</i></li> <li>• <i>Strengthen existing communities</i></li> <li>• <i>Pursue further appropriate development where possible and related to existing communities</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Not proactive enough</i></li> <li>• <i>Infrastructure inadequate to deliver opportunities, more proactive efforts required, desired changes not yet achieved</i></li> <li>• <i>Not sufficiently proactive</i></li> </ul>
<b>g) Continue previous growth pattern</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>None – not appropriate</i></li> <li>• <i>COMMENT – Agree with policy</i></li> <li>• <i>No strength recognised</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Doesn't take advantage of new opportunities</i></li> <li>• <i>Doesn't address new opportunities and difficulties</i></li> <li>• <i>Loss of greenfield land; communities being swamped</i></li> </ul>

**Any Additional Comments:** *None*

# CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options

## OPTION B: URBAN CONTAINMENT STRATEGY

All Groups

<b>a) Exploit brownfield opportunities</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remediation, regeneration &amp; protection of the environment</li> <li>• Regeneration of unkempt derelict land and improving the environment</li> <li>• Re-use / remediation of brownfield land; protection of greenfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitations in terms of locations for development</li> <li>• No control over location of brownfield sites</li> <li>• Location predetermined by history</li> </ul>
<b>b) Allow for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adds flexibility to bring forward brownfield sites</li> <li>• Maximises the sustainability and regenerative opportunities of brownfield sites</li> <li>• Increases viability of marginal brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exacerbates the problem of location; disparity between north and south</li> <li>• Targeting greenfield land by default</li> <li>• Set precedence for releasing additional greenfield land for all brownfield sites</li> </ul>
<b>c) Reduce impact of development on the countryside</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of landscape &amp; biodiversity</li> <li>• Reduces the need for greenfield development</li> <li>• Protect countryside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overly limiting / creates limitations</li> <li>• Contrary to the aim of allowing growth to support viability of communities</li> <li>• Stifles development for villages that need it to keep them viable</li> </ul>

<b>d) Reduce the need to find new sites for development to accommodate future growth</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Targeting development at existing infrastructure</i></li> <li>• <i>Known sites provides certainty and feel good factor</i></li> <li>• <i>Protecting countryside and efficient use of land</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No weakness recognised</i></li> <li>• <i>Limits the choice and availability of sites</i></li> <li>• <i>Reduce flexibility to target development to sustain villages</i></li> </ul>
<b>e) Sustain existing service provision</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>COMMENT - Provides opportunity to co-ordinate and improve upon provision into existing settlements</i></li> <li>• <i>Makes use of existing services – less need to create new</i></li> <li>• <i>Targets development towards existing provision</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Doesn't fit population growth strategy &amp; link in with potential changes</i></li> <li>• <i>Brownfield development could limit opportunities for planning gain</i></li> <li>• <i>Need to create provision based on need</i></li> </ul>
<b>f) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Joins infrastructure with development</i></li> <li>• <i>Exploiting planning gain opportunities</i></li> <li>• <i>Reduces impact on existing residents</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Undermine viability</i></li> <li>• <i>Doesn't maximise the amount of funding that can be secured via planning gain</i></li> <li>• <i>Adverse effect on viability</i></li> </ul>

**Any Additional Comments:**

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

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

*(e) should also read "and improve"*

# CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options

## OPTION C: SUSTAINABLE GROWTH STRATEGY

All Groups

<b>a) Emphasis on key locations near transport routes</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Help integrated transport &amp; public transport growth, more sustainable &amp; choice for people without cars</i></li> <li>• <i>Public transport gives choice to people</i></li> <li>• <i>Access to Cardiff / Newport especially by rail and public transport</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environmental impact?</i></li> <li>• <i>Depends on how reliable and extensive public transport is</i></li> <li>• <i>Public transport not very strong in some areas – roads are congested</i></li> </ul>
<b>b) Target new development to support threatened services</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Better geographical balance of development</i></li> <li>• <i>Help maintain services</i></li> <li>• <i>Maintains viability of settlements</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Achievable? – a bit utopian</i></li> <li>• <i>Might weaken other areas?</i></li> <li>• <i>Depends on private sector / market</i></li> </ul>
<b>c) Expanded settlements</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If targeted to appropriate areas</i></li> <li>• <i>Support viability off all settlements</i></li> <li>• <i>Appropriate in certain cases; could counter aging populations in some areas</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Too blanket – needs to be targeted – phased process?</i></li> <li>• <i>Deflects development from less popular areas; impact on greenfield; if settlements merge they lose identity</i></li> <li>• <i>Infrastructure pressures; and if on greenfield site – environmental damage</i></li> </ul>

<b>d) Potential impact on the countryside</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Could be minimised if on sustainable development principles</i></li> <li>• <i>Tourism and planning gain to increase healthy recreational facilities</i></li> <li>• <i>Tourism development – its design important</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Harm to environment &amp; wildlife</i></li> <li>• <i>Negative environmental impact</i></li> <li>• <i>Environmental damage</i></li> </ul>
<b>e) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provide affordable housing, infrastructure and development in step</i></li> <li>• <i>Exploiting planning gain</i></li> <li>• <i>Need more emphasis on basic infrastructure – lack of other funding for it</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Undermines viability of some development</i></li> <li>• <i>Infrastructure investment spread over a wide area</i></li> <li>• <i>Increase house prices – WAG may reduce its support</i></li> </ul>
<b>f) Proactively targeting growth to the Mid Valley and Upper Valley Areas</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Regeneration</i></li> <li>• <i>Eases pressure on high demand areas</i></li> <li>• <i>Boost Upper Valley area</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Lack of suitable sites? Market may not deliver</i></li> <li>• <i>Longer &amp; additional commuting journeys (to Cardiff)</i></li> <li>• <i>Lower Islwyn also needs a boost (falling school role numbers) – Mid Valleys area filling up?</i></li> </ul>

<b>g) Prevent over heating in the Caerphilly Basin</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Protect environment</i></li> <li>• <i>Take pressure off land in the Basin</i></li> <li>• <i>Quality of life; infrastructure capacity</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Limits market growth &amp; link to Cardiff</i></li> <li>• <i>Forcing people to go further north – limiting choice</i></li> <li>• <i>Less roof tax</i></li> </ul>
<b>h) Development targeted to reflect the role and function of individual settlements</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Allows flexibility – very positive – positive future for whole borough</i></li> <li>• <i>Balanced approach across the borough and viability of communities</i></li> <li>• <i>Helps sustain communities; deliver each area's individual character</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Big brother approach?</i></li> <li>• <i>Difficult to implement / fine tune; too restrictive – look at wider sub regional needs</i></li> <li>• <i>Nimbyism?</i></li> </ul>
<b>i) Release of greenfield sites to bolster declining settlements</b>	
<i>Strength</i>	<i>Weakness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Regeneration of communities must be sustainable development &amp; good design</i></li> <li>• <i>Improves viability of communities – wider social mix</i></li> <li>• <i>Will sustain the community as long as it is in scale with existing</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environmental impact</i></li> <li>• <i>Can become dormitory settlements – will incomers participate in community?</i></li> <li>• <i>Environmental impact</i></li> </ul>

**Any Additional Comments:** None

## CAERPHILLY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Developing Strategy options

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

### All Groups

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

<b>OPTION B: URBAN CONTAINMENT STRATEGY</b>	<b>Strongly Support</b>	<b>Strongly Oppose</b>
a) Exploit brownfield opportunities	✓ ✓ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Allow for growth in areas where brownfield sites are available	✓ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

c) Reduce impact of development on the countryside	✓ ✓ ✓ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Reduce the need to find new sites for development to accommodate future growth	✓ <input type="checkbox"/>	✗ <input type="checkbox"/>
e) Sustain existing service provision	<input type="checkbox"/>	✗ <input type="checkbox"/>
f) Development to provide necessary infrastructure improvements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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